PACIFIC UNITARIAN SCHOOL FOR THE MINISTRY
NON MINISTRARI SED MINISTRARE
INCORPORATED
MAY 12. 1906

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

PURCHASED WITH THE INCOME OF THE FUND
GIVEN BY

FREDERICK MADGE
1820-1908

SON OF THE REV. THOS. MADGE, 1786-1870, OF
ESSEX STREET CHAPEL, LONDON, 1825-1859

THE

CHRISTIAN TEACHER;

A

THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY JOURNAL.

VOLUME SECOND.

NEW SERIES.

[Ja. H. Thom, ed.]

LONDON:
JOHN GREEN, 121, NEWGATE STREET;
W. TAIT, EDINBURGH; HEDDERWICK AND SON, GLASGOW; CUMMING, DUBLIN; ARCHER AND SON, BELFAST; KING AND CO., CORK; WILLMER AND SMITH, LIVERPOOL; FORREST, MANCHESTER; DRAKE, BIRMINGHAM; PHILP, BRISTOL.

1840.

RICHARD KINDER, PRINTER,
GREEN ARBOUR COURT, OLD BAILEY.

X 288.4
C 89 v.6

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

NEW SERIES.

NUMBER VII.

PAGE
Art. I.—The Oxford School of Theology 1
Art. II.—The Pictorial Shakspere 42
Art. III.—On Freedom and Authority 54
Art. IV.—Heresies of Samuel Taylor Coleridge 71
Art. V.—The Integrity of the Canon of Holy Scripture maintained against Unitarian Objections 82

Art. VI.—Notices of New Publications :—

- I. Sketches of Married Life. By Mrs. Follen 88
- II. Publications of the Sunday School Association . . 91
- III. National Establishments of Religion, considered in connexion with Justice, Christianity, and Human Nature. By John Taylor 93
- IV.—Inaugural Addresses by Lords Rectors of Glasgow University 94
- V.—“ The fear o' the Folk.” By Philip Harwood . . 96

Intelligence :—

- The Fifth Report of the Sunday School Association, 1839 . 98
- Unitarianism in Edinburgh 99
- Liverpool Domestic Mission Society 110
- Manchester College, York 118

Poetry.—Psalm CVI, p. 69.

NUMBER VIII.

Art. I.—The Nature and Design of Christianity investigated from an Analysis of its Primitive Records, contained in the New Testament 119
Art. II.—The Character of the Italian Statesmen of the 14th and 15th Centuries 137
Art. III.—The Spirit of Truth that guideth into Truth 150
Art. IV.—Heine 164
Art. V.—A Discourse on the latest Form of Infidelity. By Andrews Norton 169
Art. VI.—Socialism 186
Art. VII.—Mémoires de Luther 197
Art. VIII.—The Religious Controversies of the Times 205
Art. IX.—Traditions of the East 208
Art. X.—Children's Books. 211

New Publications :—

- I.—Letters on Unitarianism, by H. H. Piper . . . 216
- II.—Geraldine 218
- III.—The Works of William E. Channing, D.D. . . . 219

5745

NUMBER IX.

PAGE
Art. I.—The Nature and Design of Christianity investigated from an Analysis of its Primitive Records, contained in the New Testament 221
Art. II.—Memoirs of the Life of Sir Samuel Romilly 242
Art. III.—Spain 264
Art. IV.—Practical Remarks on the Education of the People . . 276
Art. V.—Christian Union: or, Churches without Dogmatism . . 297
Art. VI.—Dr. Tuckerman 310
New Publications:—
I.—Disquisitions on the Theology and Metaphysics of Scripture 325
II.—Discourses. By John Cameron 330
III.—Be not Deceived 336
IV.—Letters and Papers by the late Theodosia Viscountess Powerscourt 337
Intelligence:—
British and Foreign Unitarian Association 340
London Domestic Mission Society 342
Sunday-School Association 343
Poetry.—On Christ, p. 308.

NUMBER X.

Art. I.—The Nature and Design of Christianity investigated from an Analysis of its Primitive Records, contained in the New Testament 345
Art. II.—Practical Remarks on Popular Education. By a Schoolmaster. No. II. 372
Art. III.—On Religion considered with respect to its Source, its Forms, and its Developments. By M. Benjamin Constant. Vol. 2, Book 4, Chap. 11 390
Art. IV.—On the Mutual Relationship existing between the three first or Synoptical Gospels. By Dr. Karl August Credner . 406
Art. V.—The New Testament, translated from the Text of J. J. Griesbach. By Samuel Sharpe 416
Art. VI.—Spain 430
Art. VII.—A Letter to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of London, on his Lordship's Opposition to the proposed Reformation of the Laws of Clerical Subscription. By Henry Erskine Head, A.M., Rector of Feniton, Devon, and Chaplain to His Majesty the King of Hanover 445
Intelligence:—
Tenth Report of the Irish Unitarian Christian Society, 1840 . 448
St. Mark's Chapel, Edinburgh 450
Christian Unitarian Church, Aberdeen . . . . . . *ib.*
Opening of the Duckinfield Chapel 451
Letter to the Standing Committee of the Proprietors of the Church in Federal Street . . . . *ib.*
Historical Memoirs of Dr. Tuckerman, from the Boston Monthly Miscellany of Religion and Letters 455
Poetry:—
Channing 444
The Sower 447

CONTENTS.

ART. PAGE
I.—The Nature and Design of Christianity investigated from an Analysis of its Primitive Records, contained in the New Testament 345
II.—Practical Remarks on Popular Education 372
III.—On Religion considered with respect to its Source, its Forms, and its Developments 390
IV.—On the mutual Relationship existing between the Three First or Synoptical Gospels 406
V.—The New Testament, translated from the Text of J. J. Griesbach 416
VI.—Spain 430
VII.—A Letter to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of London, on his Lordship's Opposition to the Proposed Reformation of the Laws of Clerical Subscription . 445

Intelligence :—

Tenth Report of the Irish Unitarian Christian Society, 1840 448
St. Mark's Chapel, Edinburgh . , . . 450
Christian Unitarian Church, Aberdeen . . . . *ib.*
Opening of the Duckinfield Chapel 451
Letter to the Standing Committee of the Proprietors of the Church in Federal Street . . . . . . *ib.*
Historical Memoir of Dr. Tuckerman, from the Boston Monthly Miscellany of Religion and Letters . 455

POETRY :—

Channing 444
The Sower . . . . . , . . . 447

THE
CHRISTIAN TEACHER.

ART. I.—THE OXFORD SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY.

1. *Tracts for the Times.* By Members of the University of Oxford. London, Rivingtons.
2. *Ancient Christianity, and the Doctrines of the Oxford Tracts.* By the Author of "Spiritual Despotism." London, Jackson and Walford.
3. *Tradition unveiled: or an Exposition of the pretensions and tendency of Authoritative teaching in the Church.* By the Rev. Baden Powell, Savilian Professor of Geometry, Oxford. London, Parker.

WE have thought it would be performing an acceptable service for our readers, to collect some detailed account of the Theology of the New Oxford School. A great deal is said upon this subject, with no very accurate ideas of what exactly constitute the characteristics of the School. Some think it a return to Popery. Some think it a barrier thrown up against the further advances of Popery in this Country, which the alarmists of the Church of England are evidently expecting to be, ere long, under the spiritual jurisdiction of Rome. That the Church of England should have such a horror of the Church of Rome can only be explained on the principle of their being caricatures of each other, and therefore mutually regarded, as personally insulting. This it is that makes all proximates in religion so bitterly hostile. They recognize their own features slightly distorted, and self-complacency cannot bear that the glass should be thus held up to nature.

The Oxford Theology, in our apprehension of it, is not so much an approach to Roman Catholicism as a revolt from the coarseness and vulgarity of the Evangelical School. That School, with the want of refinement and high cultivation that characterize the portion of the Clergy that belong to it, with its unspiritual views of personal religion, with the rudeness and emptiness of its public ministrations, with its offensive representations of the saving influences of Christian faith, must necessarily be an object of dislike, if not of disgust, to that more highly educated portion of the Clergy who combine great refinement of religious feeling, with profound learning and some philosophy. To such a man as Mr. Keble, earnest, spiritual, cherishing his religious faith in the sanctuary within, as a thing too sacred for vulgar utterance, and to be spoken of only with a holy "reserve," the open rudeness, the absence of all delicacy either of conception or of sentiment, the daring familiarity and self-satisfaction with which an Evangelical preacher treats both God and Man, must be absolutely unendurable. To such a mind evangelical preaching must be an outrageous insolence; an unfeeling desecration of things most holy—all the more intolerable that he cannot entirely renounce and disown it, that it is in substance his own faith, only taking its form from the coarser order of religious natures. A poet's ideal, fearlessly embodied by a daring dauber, could not be an object of more painful contemplation.

Where are such minds to find a refuge from this popular profanation of religion, when the very sanctuary of the Church, in theory the antagonist of Fanaticism, has practically become the head-quarters of Methodism; and the Ministers of our stately Establishment are no longer to be distinguished from the Ministers of the lowest Conventicle, in the vulgarity of their modes of influence, their appeals to the religious passions, their stripping off of all reserve and refinement for the sake of adaptation to the People? The cold, formal, stately Establishment, fairly vanquished by the warmer faith and fervour of Dissent, has seized the weapons of its opponents, and is now encountering Methodism with bolder Methodism, out-Heroding Herod in a contest of religious Extravagance. If we dreaded having our religious feelings wounded, hearing Christianity unspiritualized, and God spoken of humanly, we dare no more enter an Evangelical Church, than one of those brick buildings, got up on an emergency, that are appearing every day in the midst of crowded populations, and are adapted to the first and lowest developments of the religious sentiment. Of course such a contest as this must be ultimately ruinous to the Establishment; and its more refined and educated Members see this consequence with great clearness. It is not to spread fanaticism, and bigotry, and the coarser religious passions over the Land, that the aristocracy maintain the Church of England. This at least, in their apprehension, is a work that may very safely be left to the operation of a voluntary principle; and if the Establishment connects itself with such a service, it will very soon have its most formidable Enemies in that aristocratical class, whether of exclusive rank or of higher refinement, which has hitherto furnished its most powerful supporters. Let the Establishment become vulgar in its modes of ministration, and what is there to recommend it to the higher classes whose strong will now upholds it; or how can it any longer perform even in imagination its idly vaunted function of a break-water against the floods of popular fanaticism? The Evangelical Clergy, with their own hands, have broken down the Church barriers, and let in the popular torrent on their own cold and still waters. They have effected this chiefly by their adoption of the popular principle of salvation by Faith, in its least spiritual and most dogmatical character. Salvation by Faith, by the power of internal convictions, of spiritual reliances and inward springs of peace with God, which is the true idea of Protestantism, was in the very earliest ages of the Reformation hardened down into the mechanical fixture, that Salvation by Faith, as opposed to Church Salvation, or Salvation by Authority, meant Salvation by a *faith* in certain fixed creeds and articles. Salvation by Faith, which in Luther's original conception of it, meant salvation by the power of *inward sentiment*, soon came to be materialized into salvation by *belief*, belief in a certain set of accurately-defined propositions. It is in this way that some of the noblest ideas of Christianity have been materialized and destroyed. It is in this way that its idea of a universal Church, a spiritual union among its members, has become limited to the idea of a compact and organized body, all *thinking* alike; not united in moral and religious sentiment, but agreeing in the adoption of some outward symbol, or confession, which is made the bond of church union. The Nicene Creed had virtually supplanted the spirit of the Gospel, as the uniting principle, or rather ligament, of the Churches. The evangelical Clergy have united with the more popular forms of Dissent in reducing Salvation by Faith into the more definite shape of Salvation by Doctrines, and finally by still more of tangibleness and limitation, into Salvation by the Atonement. This is now made the great distinguishing feature of popular Protestantism. In the prosecution of this idea the Evangelical Clergy have fairly stripped themselves of the Priestly character, and made their appeal to the hearts, or imaginations, of the people, solely on the ground of faith in this one doctrine. So far they have been led a certain length towards the adoption of a true and spiritual principle, the abandonment of the *priestly* administration of *rites* as essential to Salvation, and have identified themselves, unconsciously, with the Dissenting principle of the sole efficacy of Faith, and the rejection of Ecclesiastical Authority. The more refined and fastidious of the Clergy of the Establishment have long looked upon these popular innovations, this unchurching of the Church, with extreme distaste. They have clearly seen that this is virtually to destroy the *spiritual* functions of the Establishment, to strip it of all peculiarly *religious* privilege, and to reduce it in fact to a merely temporal institution, a convenient provision for the outward support of Religion, but holding no especial connexion with its Author and Founder, and conferring no especial benefits on its members. It is impossible that any refined mind, just as well as a pious, can defend the existence of an Establishment enjoying peculiar temporal privileges, on such principles as these. If the spiritual functions of the church are all performed by Dissent, it is impossible on any principle of equity, to justify the existence of an Establishment coercing and excluding forms of Christianity acknowledged to be in all spiritual offices, as influential as itself. This is a flagrant inconsistency in every Evangelical Clergyman. Why does he belong to an Establishment that rejects from its bosom that portion of the Dissenting Church which he himself acknowledges performs all the spiritual functions of the Church of Christ? Why does he as a preacher of Christianity, in all his religious relations, place himself on exactly the same ground as the orthodox dissenting Teacher, and yet as an Ecclesiastic, in matters that he acknowledges not to be Essential, split the Church of Christ? The more consistent Churchmen, represented chiefly by the Oxford School, by connecting it with the influence of the *Sacraments*, as the only legitimate channel of spiritual efficacy, do not allow the doctrine of Salvation by Faith to degenerate into the popular principle of Salvation by the Atonement, preached by Dissent as well as by the Church; and by limiting the Efficacious administration of the Sacraments to legitimate Priests, descending in an unbroken line of Authority from the apostles, they save the Establishment from the merely worldly character of a temporal provision for the support of a Clergy, performing no peculiar spiritual functions, but monopolizing, notwithstanding, the patronage of the Nation. In this way the Oxford School protect, or think they protect, the doctrine of Salvation by the Atonement, from being claimed as the common property of the dissenters: and the character of the Establishment from degenerating into a merely worldly Church, an external Machinery for the support of Religion.

The necessity of the *Sacraments* as the only means through which the efficacy of the doctrine of the Atonement is communicated, and the necessity of the *Priest* as the only authorized and efficacious administrator of the Sacraments, thus constitute the leading distinctions of the Oxford Theology. They are briefly summed up in the two essentials, of the Sacraments, and the Apostolical Succession.

We think it must be very clear that these are the only principles on which it is possible for any consistent man to remain a Member of the Church of England. A more rigid consistency in the same path would, to be sure, drive him back on the Church of Rome, but still, as far as he goes, the Oxford Theologian is, what the Evangelical Clergyman is not, consistent. The Evangelical Clergy have their proper place among the more vulgar and rampant of the orthodox dissenters. They are not properly Churchmen. The Oxford School constitute the only proper Members of the Church of England; and yet the difference between them and the Church of Rome is one only of taste and feeling on one or two points, and not one of essential principles. They happen to dislike one or two tenets of the Roman Church;—but this is only accidental, and they are both alike the disciples of AUTHORITY. There is however this difference, the Roman Catholic Church reposes on Authority for its own sake, and accepts it as a first principle; the Oxford Theological School is driven back upon Authority as the only foundation on which it is possible to rest, with any show of consistency, the Church of England modification of Protestantism. We understand from a quarter well informed as to the early tendencies of the men who are now the leaders of the Oxford School, that they were, almost universally, dissatisfied with so-called Protestant methods of establishing church doctrines, and that seeing clearly the utter untenableness of connecting a free examination of the Scriptures and individual competency to find the truth therein, with the Orthodoxy that claims to be the genuine result of such an Examination, the first manifestation of this state of mind was in the direction of Rationalism. Strongly biassed however by their habits of education, by their long associations of every thing sacred with Church symbols, they shrunk back in alarm from the dreaded association of Reason with Religion, and since for their clear minds there was no middle ground, the recoil from Rationalism threw them necessarily on the bosom of Authority. That this is their History, will appear, we think, clearly in their own account of their own views. In the extracts we shall give, they are constantly encountering the Evangelicals with the single argument, that if the Authority of the Primitive Church is denied, it is impossible to disown either the leading principles or the particular conclusions of Rationalism. Reject Authority, and you must necessarily go on to Unitarianism, is their uniform method of defence. Indeed it is not a little startling and instructive to find the Evangelicals classed with Socinians, as partaking of a common tendency, in the Tracts for the Times. The Oxford School are most ably fighting the battles of Unitarianism, that is, of Reason in connection with Religion; and when they have dispossessed the Evangelical Church and the Orthodox Dissenters of their present untenable position, they will only have proved that there is no legitimate Protestantism except in the direction of Rationalism, of individual liberty *and safety* of opinion.

We shall now present our evidences of this character of the Oxford Theology, selected from their own statements, with the view of furnishing our readers with a tolerably complete description of this important School.

We shall begin with that important subject which lies at the root of all the conflicting views of Christianity, the ideas entertained of the nature of the Scriptures.

Their leading idea of the Scriptures is that they *contain* the church doctrines, but that they do not *teach* or fully *express* them; that they are there, but only by implication,—and that you could not find them there, unless you previously knew that they were there. Here we obtain our *first* admission from the Oxford School of a fact that Unitarians have long declared, namely, the absence of any precise code, *or dogmatic formulary of doctrine*, from the Scriptures. It is necessary that we should verify so startling an assertion, by giving it in their own words. In the following statement they openly avow that every one who walks by *the Scriptures alone* deserts the Church, and that therefore if the Church has the truth, there must be some other authority than Scripture, for by the consent of all men, the "Church is not Scriptural." They state this want of Scriptural authority as a frequent objection to their peculiar views, and they unreservedly admit the force of the objection.

> " 'All this that you say about the Church (say the Objectors) is very specious, and very attractive; but where is it to be found in the inspired volume?' And that it is *not* to be found there, (says the Oxford Churchman) that is, I mean, not found as fully as it might be, seems to them proved at once by the simple fact, that *all* persons (as I may say, for the exceptions are very few),—*all* those who try to go by Scripture only, fall away from the Church and her doctrines, to one

or other sect or party, as if showing that whatever is or is not Scriptural, at least the Church, by consent of all men, is not so."—*Tracts for the Times,* No. 85, p. 2.

In the following passage the doctrine of the Trinity is declared to rest upon no better Scriptural proof than the doctrine of the Apostolical Succession; and then with the usual unfairness of ecclesiastical logic it is suggested that it may be as "dreadful" and dangerous to deny the legitimacy of the Priest as to reject the all-essential Trinity:

> "Thus for instance a person who denies the Apostolical Succession of the Ministry, because it is not clearly taught in Scripture, ought, I conceive, if consistent, to deny the Godhead of the HOLY GHOST, *which is no where literally stated in Scripture.* Yet there is something so dreadful in his denying the latter, that one may often feel afraid to show him his inconsistency, lest, rather than admit the Apostolical Succession, he should consent to do so."—No. 85, p. 4.

Precisely the same difficulties, it is openly avowed, meet almost every other important Church Doctrine: there is no Scripture *proof* of them; they rest upon Authority:

> "If the words Altar, Absolution, or Succession, are not in Scripture (supposing it), neither is the word TRINITY.
>
> "Again: how do we know that the New Testament is inspired? does it any where declare this of itself? *No where*; how then do we know it? we infer it from the circumstances that the office of the Apostles who wrote it was what it was, and from the Old Testament being inspired.
>
> "Again: consider whether the doctrine of the *Atonement* may not be explained away by those who explain away the doctrine of the *Eucharist:* if the expressions used concerning the latter are merely figurative, so may be those of the former.
>
> "Again: on how many texts does the doctrine of *Original Sin* rest, that is, the doctrine that we are individually born under God's displeasure, in consequence of the Sin of Adam? on *one or two.*
>
> "Again: how do we prove the doctrine of justification by faith only? *it is no where declared in Scripture.*"—No. 85, p. 12.

These are candid and bold admissions, which we never should have wrung from Orthodoxy, if they had not been necessary to build up the church doctrine of Authority. They are made, as soon as to make them subserves a Church purpose. The Oxford School claim for the Church system, as they style their Theology, that it *is in* Scripture, but "given in an *indirect* and covert way," "not on the surface of Scripture, but contained in a latent form within it, and to be maintained only by indirect arguments,—and by overcoming, or resigning oneself to difficulties." Of course *Authority* is the guide out of these difficulties, and in fact the *revealer* of what *is in* Scripture. We shall give in the words of the Tracts for the Times, the argument by which the Oxford School demonstrates, and we think successfully, that there is no middle ground tenable between their own system and Romanism, for "Latitudinarianism," that is, an undogmatic Christianity, they hold to be so completely "out of the question," as to be hardly worth adverting to.

"Revelation implies a something revealed, and what is revealed is imperative on our faith, *because* it is revealed. Revelation implies imperativeness; it limits in its very notion our liberty of *thought*, because it limits our liberty of *error*, for error is one kind of thought.

"But now, putting aside abstract considerations, let us turn to the *fact* which is urged in behalf of Latitudinarianism. The doctrine, then, that it matters not what you believe, so that you act up to what you believe, is grounded (it would seem) on this alleged fact, that no one creed of any sort can be surely gathered from Scripture,—that the divine message, the whole counsel of God, is not there. 'Whichever view of religion you fix upon (it is said), there are parts of it which, by a candid, dispassionate, unprejudiced observer, will be pronounced additions to Scripture; *therefore* (it is inferred), there *is no* definite creed or message at all revealed anywhere.' Indeed! Supposing the fact to be as stated (which I do not grant, but supposing it), is this the necessary conclusion? No: there is another. Such an inference, indeed, as the above, is a clever controversial way of settling the matter: it is the sort of answer which, in the schools of disputation or the courts of law, may find a place, where men are not in earnest: but it is an answer without a *heart*. It is an excuse for indolence, love of quiet, or worldliness. There is *another* answer. I do not adopt it, I do not see I am driven to it, because I do not allow the premises from which the argument starts. I do not allow that there *is* no creed at all contained in Scripture, though I grant it is not on the surface. But if there *be* no divine message, gospel, or creed, *produceable* from Scripture, this would not lead me one iota towards deciding that there was none at all *anywhere*. No: it would make me look *out* of Scripture for it, that is all. If there is a revelation there must be a doctrine; both our reason and our hearts tell us so. If it is not in Scripture, it is somewhere else, it is to be sought elsewhere. Should the fact so turn out, (which I deny) that Scripture is so obscure that nothing can be made of it, even when the true interpretation is otherwise given, so obscure that every person will have his own interpretation, and no two alike, this would drive me, not into Latitudinarianism, but into Romanism. Yes, and it will drive the multitude of men. It is far more certain that revelation must contain a message, than that that message must be in Scripture. It is a less violence to one's feelings to say that part of it is revealed elsewhere, than to say that nothing is revealed anywhere. There is an overpowering antecedent improbability in Almighty God's announcing that He has revealed something, and revealing nothing: there is no antecedent improbability in His revealing it elsewhere than in an inspired volume. And, I say, the mass of mankind will feel it so. It is very well for educated persons, at their ease, with few cares, or in the joyous time of youth, to argue and speculate about the impalpableness and versatility of the divine message, its chameleon-like changeableness, its adaptation to each fresh mind it meets; but when men are conscious of sin, are sorrowful, are weighed down, are desponding, they ask for something to lean on, something external to themselves. It will not do to tell them that whatever they at present hold as true, is enough. They want to be assured that what seems to them true, is true; they want something to lean on, holier, diviner, more stable than their own minds. They have an instinctive feeling that there is an external, eternal truth, which is their only stay, and it mocks them, after being told of a revelation, to be assured next that that revelation tells us nothing certain, nothing which we do not know without it, nothing distinct from our own impressions concerning it, whatever they may be,—nothing such as to exist independently of that shape and colour into which our own individual mind happens to throw it. Therefore, practically, those who argue for the vague character of the Scripture informations, and the harmlessness of all sorts of religious opinions, do not tend to advance Latitudinarianism one step among the many; they advance Romanism. That truth, which men are told they cannot find in Scripture, they will seek *out* of Scripture. They will never believe, they will never be content with, a religion without doctrines. The common sense of mankind decides against it. Religion cannot but be dogmatic, it ever has been. All religions have had doctrines; all have professed to carry with them benefits which could be enjoyed only on condition of believing the word of a supernatural informant, that is, of embracing some doctrines or other. It is a mere idle sophistical theory, to suppose it can be otherwise. *Destroy* religion, make men give it up, if you can; but while it exists, it will profess an insight into the next world, it will profess *important* information about the next world, it will have points of faith, it will have dogmatism, it will have anathemas. Christianity, therefore, ever will be looked on, by the multitude, as it is, as a rule of faith as well as of conduct. Men may be Presbyterians, or Baptists, or Lutherans, or Calvinists, or Wesleyans; but something or other they will be; a creed, a creed necessary to salvation, they will have: a creed either in Scripture or out of it; and if in Scripture, I say, hidden in Scripture, indirectly gained from Scripture. Latitudinarianism, then, is out of the question; and you have this choice, to be content with indirect proofs *in* Scripture, or to look for tradition *out of* Scripture. You cannot get beyond this; *either* you must take up with us, (or with some system not at all better off, whether Presbyterianism, or independency, or the like,) *or* you must go to Rome. Which will you choose? You may not like us; you may be impatient and impetuous; you may go forward, but back you cannot go."—No. 85, pp. 18—20.

The views entertained by the Oxford School of the general structure of the Bible, are, we think, a very close approximation to the truth, though adopted, or at least announced, only for the purpose of establishing the necessity of an authoritative Tradition. The structure of Scripture is declared by them to be irregular, immethodical, and unsystematic, and to have all the characteristics that might attach to an uninspired book. It is described as, not one book, but a great number of writings, of various persons, living at various times, and put together in its existing form, as if casually and by accident. "It is as if you were to seize the papers or correspondence of leading men in any school of philosophy or science, which were never designed for publication, and bring them out in one volume." In such a chance miscellany, there would be "many repetitions, many hiatuses, many things which looked like contradictions; you would have to work your way through heterogeneous materials, and after your best efforts, there would be much hopelessly obscure; or on the other hand, you might look in vain in such a casual collection for some particular opinion, which the writers were known nevertheless to have held, nay, to have insisted on. Such, I conceive, with limitations presently to be noticed, is the structure of the Bible."* From such a view of the structure of the Bible, the Oxford Theologian, since he is determined on the necessity of finding dogmas somewhere, very naturally infers the great improbability that it *should* contain the whole of the revealed word of God. Nevertheless, at least as far as regards matters of faith, they hold that it does *contain* all that is necessary for salvation. Our readers will perhaps feel surprised at the unreserved way in which all *Scriptural* proof of the inspiration of the New Testament, and of its sufficiency, are unhesitatingly declared not to exist. "By parallel acts of power, He both secretly inspired the books, and secretly formed them into a perfect rule or canon. I shall not prove what we all admit, but I state it to prevent misapprehension. If asked *how* we know this to be the case, I answer, *that the early Church thought so*, which must have known. And, if this answer does not please, the inquirer may look out for a better one as he can. I know of no other." Again,—"both the history of its composition, and its internal structure, are against its being a complete depository of the Divine Will, *unless the early Church says it is.* Now the early Church does not tell us this. It does not seem to have considered that a complete code of *morals*, or Church *government*, or of *rites*, or of *discipline*, is in Scripture." It is thus the opinion of the Oxford School, that the Scriptures do not contain a perfect system of *morals, rites*, or *discipline;* that these are derived from Tradition; and that it is merely by accident that the *doctrines* of faith are even indirectly, latently, covertly, there,—in fact, to use their own words, "it is a near thing that they are in Scripture at all." One of the instances specified of this *almost* absence of an important doctrine from the Bible, is the mere accident, and in the very nick of time, that enables Theologians to identify the Devil with the serpent that tempted Eve. "The nearest approach to any intimation of it is in the *last book of the Bible*, where the devil is called 'that old serpent.' Can we be surprised that other truths are but obscurely conveyed in Scripture, when this hardly escapes (as I may say) omission?" The *Ritual*, which the Oxford priests hold to be essential, is, according to them, *not* "in Scripture at all;" and the *Belief*, only incidentally, disguisedly, and "by a sort of accident." Here is abundant room made for the introduction of the principle of AUTHORITY. Not a few, however, will perceive that the room thus made may quite as well be filled by the principles of individual LIBERTY and REASON. If Dogmas can only be maintained by such supports, not a few will give the preference to a spiritual Christianity, which can have no adequate expression but the life and personal embodiment of Christ.

---

* Vol. V. p. 31.

There is a severe and an "unkind" cut directed against the ease and comfort of the Established Church, in the Oxford School's method of meeting the Scriptural difficulty, that "nothing is said concerning Absolution, or the Lord's Supper, as the means of forgiveness; in short, that the *tone* of the New Testament is unsacramental, and the impression it leaves on the mind is not that of a Priesthood and its attendant system." Admit this, and they do admit it,—but then they ask,

> " . . 'Is the tone of Scripture more unfavourable to the doctrine of a Priesthood than it is to the idea of Christianity, such as we are brought up to regard it,—I mean of an established, endowed, dignified Church; and if its establishment is not inconsistent (as it is not) with the New Testament, why should its mysticalness be? Certainly, if *any* thing is plain, it is that Scripture represents, that the very *portion* of all Christians is tribulation, want, contempt, persecution. I do not,—of course not, far from it,—I do not say that the actual present state of the Church Catholic, and the text of the New Testament, are not reconcilable: but is it not a fact, that the first *impression* from Scripture of what the Church should be, is not fulfilled in what we see around us?"—Vol. V. p. 89.

In the same broad way it is admitted, that the divinity of Christ is as much an addition to the simplicity of the Gospels, as the "Priestly and Sacramental System,"—and that if Scripture alone is to be followed, Paul is an innovator upon Jesus, and that it even may be maintained that Jesus did not contemplate including the Heathens in his Gospel, that it was a mere *afterthought* of the ambitious apostles.

"...It is objected that the Church system, the great Episcopal, Priestly, Sacramental system, was an afterthought, a corruption coming upon the simplicity of the primitive and Apostolic religion. The primitive religion, it is said, was more *simple.* More *simple*! Did objectors never hear, that there have been unbelievers who have written to prove that Christ's religion was more simple than St. Paul's—that St. Paul's Epistles are 'a second system,' coming upon the Gospels, and changing their doctrine? Have we never heard that some have considered the doctrine of our Lord's Divinity an addition upon the 'simplicity' of the Gospels? Yes: this has been the belief not only of heretics, as the Socinians, but of infidels, such as the historian Gibbon, who looked at things with less of prejudice than heretics, as having no point to maintain. I think it will be found quite as easy to maintain that the Divinity of Christ was an afterthought, brought in by the Greek Platonists and other philosophers, upon the simple and primitive creed of the Galilean fishermen, as infidels say, as that the Sacramental system came in from the same source, as the rationalists say.—But to return to the point before us. Let it be considered whether a very plausible case might not be made out, by way of proving that our Blessed Lord did *not* contemplate the evangelizing of the heathen at all, but that it was an *afterthought*, when His Apostles began to succeed, and their ambitious hopes to rise."—Vol. V. p. 63.

We have a still further, and more remarkable admission, that not the Scriptures only *conceal* these essential articles of the true Faith, but that also the Early Church *concealed* these same all-important doctrines, for that certainly for a long period of her history they do not appear. Unitarians have here again received at last tardy justice from the Oxford School, as soon as an Ecclesiastical necessity came into existence that the admission must be made.

"Secondly, it is also certain that the early Church did herself conceal these same Church doctrines. I am not determining whether or not all her writers did, or all her teachers, or at all times, but merely that viewing that early period as a whole, there is on the whole a great secrecy observed in it concerning such doctrines (e. g.) as the Trinity and the Eucharist; that is, the early Church did the very thing which I have been supposing Scripture does,—conceal high truths. To suppose that Scripture conceals them, is not an hypothesis invented to meet the difficulty arising from the fact that they are not on the surface; for the early Church, independent of that alleged difficulty, did herself in her own teaching conceal them. This is a second very curious coincidence. If the early Church had reasons for concealment, perchance Scripture has the same; especially if we suppose,—what at the very least is no very improbable idea,—that the system of the early Church is a continuation of the system of those inspired men who wrote the New Testament."

Indeed, *the authority of the Scriptures* themselves is openly declared by the Oxford School to have no other foundation than has the Church system, namely, the example of the early ages of Christianity: and that if we only take as much of the Church system as we please, by a parallel reasoning, we may only take as much of the Scriptures as we please.

"Objectors then speak thus: 'We are far from denying,' they say, 'that there is truth and value in the ancient Catholic system, as reported by the Fathers; but we deny it is *unmixed* truth. We consider it is truth and error mixed together; we do not see why the system of doctrine must be taken together as a whole, so that if one part is true, all is true. We consider we have a right to take it piecemeal, and examine each part by itself; that so far as it is true, it is true not as belonging to the ancient system, but for other reasons, as being agreeable to our reason, or to our understanding of Scripture, not because stated by the Fathers; and, after all, the Church system in question (that is, such doctrines as the mystical power of the Sacraments, the power of the keys, the grace of Ordination, the gifts of the Church, and the Apostolical Succession), has very little *primitive* authority. The Fathers whom we have, not only might have been of an earlier date, but contradict each other; they declare what is incredible and absurd, and what can reasonably be ascribed to Platonism, or Judaism, or Paganism.'

"Be it so: well, how will the same captious spirit treat the sacred Canon? in just the same way. It will begin thus:—'These *many* books are put together in *one* book; what makes them one? who put them together? *the printers*. The books of Scripture have been *printed* together for many centuries. But that does not make them one; what authority had those who put them together to do so? what authority to put just so many books, neither more nor less? *when* were they first so put together? on what authority do we leave out the Wisdom or the Son of Sirach, and insert the book of Esther? Catalogues certainly are given of these books in early times: but exactly the same books are not enumerated in all. The language of St. Austin is favourable to the admission of the Apocrypha.* The Latin Church anciently left out the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Eastern Church left out the book of Revelation. This so-called Canon did not exist at earliest till the fourth century, between two and three hundred years after St. John's death. Let us then see into the matter with our own eyes. Why should not we be as good judges as the Church of the fourth century, on whose authority we receive it? Why should one book be divine because another is?' This is what objectors would say. Now to follow them into particulars as far as the first head; viz. as to the evidence itself, which is offered in behalf of the divinity and inspiration of the separate books.

---

* "De Doctr. Christ. ii. 13."

"For instance; the first Father who expressly mentions Commemorations for the Dead in Christ, (such as we still have in substance at the end of the prayer for the Church Militant, where it was happily restored in 1662, having been omitted a century earlier,) is Tertullian, about a hundred years after St. John's death. This, it is said, is not authority early enough to prove that that ordinance is Apostolical, though succeeding Fathers, Origen, St. Cyprian, Eusebius, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, &c. bear witness to it ever so strongly. 'Errors might have crept in by that time; mistakes might have been made; Tertullian is but one man, and confessedly not sound in many of his opinions; we ought to have clearer and more decisive evidence.' Well, supposing it; suppose Tertullian, a hundred years after St. John, is the first that mentions it, *yet Tertullian is also the first that alludes to St. Paul's Epistle to Philemon, and even he without quoting or naming it.*"

Once more:

"Again: much stress, as I have said, is laid by objectors on the fact that there is so little evidence concerning Catholic doctrine in the *first* years of Christianity. Now, how does this stand, as regards the Canon of the New Testament? The New Testament consists of twenty-seven books in all, though of varying importance. Of these, fourteen are not mentioned at all till from eighty to one hundred years after St. John's death, in which number are the Acts, the Second to the Corinthians, the Galatians, the Colossians, the Two to the Thessalonians, and St. James. Of the other thirteen, five, viz. St. John's Gospel, the Philippians, the First of Timothy, the Hebrews, and the First of John, are quoted but by one writer during the same period.

"Lastly, St. Irenæus, at the close of the second century, quotes all the books of the New Testament but five, and deservedly stands very high as a witness. Now, why may not so learned and pious a man, and so close on the Apostles, stand also as a witness of some doctrines which he takes for granted, as the invisible but real Presence in the holy Eucharist, the use of Catholic tradition in gaining the truth, and the powers committed to the Church?

"I do not see then, if men will indulge that eclectic spirit which chooses part and rejects part of the primitive Church system, what is to keep them from choosing part, and rejecting part, of the Canon of Scripture.

"But again: it is objected that the evidence of the Church doctrines, whether from Scripture or from Antiquity, is not clear or complete. Now, as far as the question of Scripture is concerned, this point has been already considered at length. The immethodical character of the evidence has been granted, and accounted for. This being the case then, it may be used to protect the proof from Antiquity, as far as it also is immethodical and incomplete. If the Fathers contradict each other in words, so do passages of Scripture contradict each other. Against the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity may be brought the text, 'Of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the Angels which are in heaven, *neither the* SON, *but* the FATHER.' * And against the doctrine of faith justifying, St. James's declaration, 'that works justify.'"—Vol. V. p. 81.

In the midst of a treatise on the structure of the Scriptures, a writer in the Tracts for the Times introduces, incidentally, the character and history of Elisha as illustrative of the claims of the Priesthood, and as it is a curiosity in its way, and some very important spiritual truth comes out towards the close of it, we extract the whole passage.

"Having mentioned Elisha, I am led to say a word or two upon his character. Men of this age are full of their dread of priestcraft and priestly ambition; and they speak and feel as if the very circumstance of a person claiming obedience upon a divine authority was priestcraft and full of evil. They speak as if it was against the religious rights of man (for some such rights are supposed to be possessed by sinners, even by those who disown the doctrine of the political rights of man), as if it were essentially an usurpation for one man to claim spiritual power over another. They do not ask for the voucher of his claim, for his commission, but think the claim absurd. They so speak, that any one who heard them, without knowing the Bible, would think that Almighty God had never given such power unto men. Now, what would such persons say to Elisha's character and conduct? Let us recount some few passages in his history, in the Second Book of Kings, and let us bear in mind what has been already observed of the character of the books of Chronicles. When the little children out of Bethel mocked him, 'he cursed them in the name of the Lord.' This was his first act after entering on his office. Again: Jehoram, the son of Ahab, put away Baal, and walked not in the sins of his father and his mother; but because he did not put away the false worship of Jeroboam, but kept to his calves, his self-appointed priests, altars, and holy days, which he probably thought a little sin, when he was in distress, and called upon Elisha, Elisha said, 'What have I to do with thee? Get thee to the prophets of thy father, and to the prophets of thy mother;' and went on to say, that but for the presence of good Jehoshaphat, 'I would not look toward thee nor see thee.' This was taking (what would now be called) a high tone. Again: the Shunammite was a great woman; he was poor. She got her husband's leave to furnish a 'little chamber' for him, not in royal style, but as for a poor minister of God. It had 'a bed and a table and a stool and a candlestick,' and when he came that way he availed himself of it. The world would think that she was the patron, and he ought to be humble, and to know his place. But observe his language on one occasion of his lodging there. He said to his servant, 'Call this Shunammite.' When she came, she, the mistress of the house, 'stood before him.' He did not speak to her, but bade his servant speak, and then she retired; then he held a consultation with his servant, and then he called her again, and 'she stood in the door:' then he promised her a son. Again: Naaman was angered that Elisha did not show him due respect: he only sent him a message, and bade him wash and be clean. Afterwards we find him interposing in political matters in Israel and Syria. Now, it is not to the purpose to account for all this, by saying he worked miracles. Are miracles necessary for being a minister of God? Are miracles the only way in which a claim can be recognised? Is a man the higher minister, the more miracles he does? Are we to honour only those who minister temporal miracles, and to be content to eat and be filled with the loaves and fishes? Are there no higher miracles than visible ones? John the Baptist did no miracles, yet he too claimed, and gained, the obedience of the Jews. Miracles *prove* a man to be God's minister, they do not *make* him God's minister. No matter how a man is proved to come from God, if he comes from God. If Christ is with his ministers, according to His promise, even to the end of the world, so that he that despiseth them despiseth Him, then, though they do no miracles, they are in office as great as Elisha. And if Baptism be the cleansing and quickening of the dead soul, to say nothing of the Lord's Supper, they do work miracles. If God's ministers are then only to be honoured when we *see* that they work miracles, where is place for faith? Are we not under a dispensation of faith, not of sight? Was Elisha great because he was seen to work miracles, or because he could, and did, work them? Is God's minister a proud priest now, for acting, as if he came from God, if he *does* come from Him? Yet men of this generation, without inquiring into his claims, would most undoubtedly call him impostor and tyrant, proud, arrogant, profane, and Antichristian, nay, Antichrist himself, if he, a Christian minister, assume one-tenth part of Elisha's state. Yes, Antichrist;—'If they have called the Master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of His household?'"—No. 85, p. 95.

---

* "Mark xiii. 32."

As we are chiefly anxious in this article to let the Oxford School describe itself, we shall close this account of their views of Scripture, with their own summing up of the connexion between the stability of the Church System, and the stability of the Bible. The argument is that both are to be received, or both rejected, for they have the very same foundation.

"I have been engaged in the last two Lectures in showing that the Canon of Scripture rests on no other foundation than the Catholic doctrines, that those who dispute the latter should, if they were consistent, —will, when they learn to be consistent,—dispute the former; that in both cases we believe, mainly, because the Church of the fourth and fifth centuries unanimously believed, and that we have at this moment to defend our belief in the Catholic doctrines merely because they come first, are the first object of attack; and that if we were not defending our belief in them, we should at this very time be defending our belief in the Canon. Let no one then hope for peace in this day; let no one attempt to purchase it by concession;—vain indeed would be that concession. Give up the Catholic doctrines, and what do you gain? an attack upon the Canon, with (to say the least) the *same* disadvantages on your part, or rather, in fact, with much greater; for the circumstance that you have already given up the Doctrines as insufficiently evidenced in primitive times, will be an urgent call on you, in consistency, to give up the Canon too. And besides, the Church doctrines may also be proved from Scripture, but no one can say that the Canon of Scripture itself can be proved to be a Canon from Scripture; no one can say, that Scripture any where enumerates all the books of which it is composed, and puts its seal upon them ever so indirectly, even if it might allowably bear witness to itself."—Vol. V. p. 102.

The Scriptures, then, not being the foundation of the Church System, it becomes necessary for the Oxford School to enter a protest against the extreme tendencies of Protestantism. In this protest there is unquestionably much truth, though full of other meanings, than that for which it is here employed.

" Every system of theology has its dangers, its tendencies towards evil. Systems short of the truth have this tendency inherent in themselves, and in process of time discover it, and work out the anticipated evil, which is but the legitimate though latent consequence of their principles. Thus, we may consider the present state of Geneva the fair result on the long run of the system of self-will which was established there in the sixteenth century. But even the one true system of religion has its dangers on all sides, from the weakness of its recipients, who pervert it. Thus the Holy Catholic doctrines, in which the Church was set up, were corrupted into Popery, not legitimately, or necessarily, but by various external causes acting on human corruption, in the lapse of many ages. St. Paul's command of obedience to rulers, was changed into the tyrannical rule of *one* Bishop over *all* countries; his recommendation of an unmarried life, for certain religious objects, was made a rule of celibacy in the case of the clergy. Now let us ask, what are the bad *tendencies* of Protestantism? for this is a question which nearly concerns ourselves. We are nearly 300 years from its rise in this country; have any evils yet shown themselves from it? It is not here proposed to examine the question at large; but a hint on one part of the subject may be made in answer to it.

" At the Reformation, the authority of the Church was discarded by the spirit then predominant among Protestants, and Scripture was considered as the sole document both for ascertaining and proving our faith. The question immediately arose, 'Is this or that doctrine in Scripture?'—and in consequence, various intellectual gifts, such as argumentative subtilty, critical acumen, knowledge of the languages, rose into importance, and became the interpreters of Christian truth. Exposition lay through controversy. Now the natural effect of disputation is to make us shun all but the strongest proofs, those which an adversary will find substantial impediments in his line of reasoning; and, therefore, to generate a cautious discriminative turn of thought, to fix in the mind a *standard* of proof simulating demonstration, and to make light of mere probabilities. This intellectual habit, resulting from controversy, would also arise from the peculiar exercises of thought necessary for the accurate scholar or antiquarian. It followed, that in course of time, all the delicate shades of truth and falsehood, the unobtrusive indications of God's will, the low tones of the 'still small voice,' in which Scripture abounds, were rudely rejected; the crumbs from the rich man's table, which Faith eagerly looks about for, were despised by the proud-hearted intellectualist, who (as if it were a favour in him to accept the Gospel,) would be content with nothing short of certainty, and ridiculed as superstitious and illogical whatever did not approve itself to his own cold, hard, and unimpassioned temper."—No. 45, pp. 1, 2.

The consequences of this temper of Protestantism, it is argued, must be the rejection of some of the most important parts of Christianity. For instance; "the practice of infant baptism; where is this *enjoined* in Scripture? *No where.* Why do we observe it? Because the primitive Church observed it, and because the apostles in Scripture *appear* to have sanctioned it, though this is not altogether certain *from* Scripture."

"But further still, infant baptism, like Episcopacy, is but a case of *discipline*. What shall we say, when we consider that a case of *doctrine*, necessary doctrine, doctrine the very highest and most sacred, may be produced, where the argument lies as little on the surface of Scripture, where the proof, though *most conclusive*, is as indirect and circuitous as that for Episcopacy; viz. the doctrine of the Trinity? Where is this solemn and comfortable mystery formally stated in Scripture, as we find it in the creeds? Why is it not? Let a man consider whether all the objections which he urges against the Scripture argument for Episcopacy may not be turned against his own belief in the Trinity. It is a happy thing for themselves that men are inconsistent; yet it is miserable to advocate and establish a *principle*, which, not in their own case, indeed, but in the case of others who learn it of them, leads to Socinianism. This being considered, can we any longer wonder at the awful fact, that the descendants of Calvin, the first Presbyterian, are at the present day in the number of those who have denied the Lord who bought them? * * * * *

"But, it may be urged, that we Protestants believe the *Scriptures* to contain the whole rule of duty.—Certainly not; they constitute a rule of *faith*, not a rule of *practice*; a rule of *doctrine*, not a rule of *conduct* or *discipline*. Where (*e. g.*) are we told in Scripture, that gambling is wrong? or again, suicide? Our Article is precise: 'Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, &c. is not to be required of any man, that it should be *believed* as an article of *faith*.' Again it says, that the

Apocrypha is *not* to be applied 'to establish any *doctrine,*' implying that *this* is the use of the canonical books."—No. 45, pp. 6—8.

The Oxford School admit another great view of the Rational School, namely, the changes of opinion and principle that necessarily take place in the course of time. These changes however, in their view, are not improvements but corruptions, are not Reformations but *require* a Reformation, that is, a restoration of the original ideas which have been departed from. Under this point of view, the Church System is an external contrivance to prevent progress. Can you point, asks the Oxford Divine, to any period of Church History, in which doctrine remained for any time uncorrupted? Three hundred years is a long time. Are you quite sure we do not need a SECOND REFORMATION?

Another admission obtained from this important School, is *the complete inefficacy of Articles to maintain uniformity of doctrine, within the articled Church.* Wonderful are the admissions these Ecclesiastics make for the sake of showing the necessity of AUTHORITY, in order to effect what the theory of orthodoxy, and popular Protestantism, never have effected. The admissions, we regard as most important, though the time and manner in which they come out, we think very little creditable to the candour and honour of Controversial Orthodoxy. These UNITARIAN TRUTHS were never acknowledged by the Church before, and would not be acknowledged now, were it not with the view of thereby acquiring for the Church and the Priesthood a more absolute Supremacy. Rationalism is acknowledged to be the tendencies of Scriptural Christianity, only in order that all those who hate Rationalism may the more readily take refuge in the Church, and submit themselves to AUTHORITY. *The admissions are irrevocable;* their purpose will not be gained.

"I observed that change of opinion was *probable.* Probable in itself you can hardly deny, considering the history of the universal Church; not extravagantly improbable, moreover, in spite of articles, as the extensively prevailing opinion to which I alluded, that the clergy have departed from them, sufficiently proves. Now consider the course of religion and politics, domestic and foreign, during the last three centuries, and tell me whether events have not occurred to increase this probability almost to a certainty; the probability, I mean, that the members of the English Church of the present day differ from the principles of the Church of Rome more than our forefathers differed. First, consider the history of the Puritans from first to last. Without pronouncing any opinion on the truth or unsoundness of their principles, were they not evidently further removed from Rome than were our Reformers? Was not their influence all on the side of leading the English Church further from Rome than our Reformers placed it? Think of the fall of the Scottish Episcopal Church. Reflect upon the separation and extinction of the Nonjurors, of the rise of Methodism, of our political alliances with foreign Protestant communities. Consider especially the history and the school of Hoadley. That man, whom a high authority of the present day does not hesitate to call a Socinian, was for near fifty years a bishop in our Church. * * * *

"What is the prevailing opinion or usage respecting the form of absolution in the office for Visiting the Sick? What is thought by a great body of men of the words in which the Priesthood is conveyed? Are there no objections to the Athanasian Creed? Does no one stumble at the word 'oblations,' in the Prayer for the Church Militant? Is there no clamour against parts of the Burial Service? No secret or scarcely secret murmurings against the word *regeneration* in the Baptismal? No bold protestations against reading the Apocrypha? Now do not all these objections rest upon one ground: viz. that these parts of our services savour of Popery? And again, are not these the popular objections of the day?

"*L.* I cannot deny it.

"*C.* I consider then that already I have said enough to show that the Church of this day has deviated from the opinions of our Reformers, and become more opposed than they were to the system they protested against. And therefore, I would observe, it is not fair to judge of me, or such as me, in the off-hand way which many men take the liberty to adopt. Men seem to think that we are plainly and indisputably proved to be Popish, if we are proved to differ from the generality of Churchmen now a-days. But what if it turn out that they are silently floating down the stream, and we are upon the shore?"—*Via Media*, No. I.

The "Via Media," the golden mean, of the Oxford School, specifies some of the middle positions it would hold between the Reformers and Popery. And first a Reformation or Restoration is needed to make

The Church independent of the State.

"When the Church with an unprecedented confidence bound herself hand and foot, and made herself over to the civil power, in order to escape the Pope, she did not expect that *infidels* (as it has lately been hinted) would be suffered to have the absolute disposal of the crown patronage."

Here Oxford leans towards Rome in *discipline*, in *doctrine* she leans *slightly* in another direction.

"Almighty God has said that his Son's merits shall wash away all sin, *and that they shall be conveyed to believers through the two Sacraments;* whereas the Church of Rome has added other ways of gaining heaven."

The Church of Rome herself could not speak of Sacraments with a more priestly exclusiveness than the following passage:

> "Do you not suppose that there are multitudes both among clergy and laity at the present day, who disparage, not indeed Christ's merits, but the Sacraments He has appointed? and if so, is not their error so far the same in kind as that of the Romish Church—the preferring Abana and Pharpar to the waters of Jordan? Take the Sacrament of Baptism. Have not some denominations of schismatics *invented* a rite of dedication instead of Baptism? and do not Churchmen find themselves under the temptation of countenancing this Papist-like presumption?—Again, there is a well-known sect, which denies both Baptism and the Lord's Supper. A Churchman must believe its members to be altogether *external* to the fold of Christ. Whatever benevolent works they may be able to show, still, if we receive the Church's doctrine concerning the means 'generally necessary to salvation,' we must consider such persons to be mere heathens, except in knowledge. Now would there not be an outcry raised, as if I were uncharitable, did I refuse the rites of burial to such an one?"—*Via Media,* No. II.

The following are some of the points on which the Oxford School would restore the stricter *discipline* of the Church, to several of which we quite agree;—to board over the *altar* of a Church, place an orchestra there of playhouse singers, and take money at the doors, seems to them as great an outrage as to sprinkle the forehead with holy water, and to carry lighted tapers in a procession;—(To this it is replied, by an objector, that George the Third was a patron of concerts in Cathedrals, and the Oxford divine answers, "that he was a religious King! and that music in a Church *may* subserve the devotional feelings, though it may *not*;") the sanctity of places set apart to the worship of God and the reception of saints that sleep; the profane practices of holding vestries in Churches; of flocking to preachers rather than to sacraments; the luxurious and fashionable fitting up of town Churches; the off-hand project of pulling them down for the convenience of streets and roads; and the wanton preference of unconsecrated places, whether for preaching to the poor, or for administering sacred rites to the rich.

There is great truth and wisdom in the following, though it is only advanced for a Church purpose, and would not now be said but for that purpose. "Nothing is more rare at this day than *quiet* thought. Every one is in a bustle, being bent to do a great deal. We preach, and run from house to house; we do not pray or meditate. But to return. Consider the first exhortation to the Communion: would it not be called, if I said it in discourse of my own, dark, cold, and formal? 'The way and the means thereto [to receive worthily] is, First, to examine your lives and conversations by the rule of God's Commandments, &c. Therefore, if any of you be a *blasphemer* of God, an *hinderer* or *slanderer* of His word, an *adulterer*, or be in *malice* or *envy*, or any other grievous crime, repent you of your sins,' &c. Now this is what is called, in some quarters, by a great abuse of terms, '*mere morality*.'" "Next consider the general confession, which prays simply that God would grant us, 'hereafter, to live a godly, righteous, and sober life.' *Righteous and sober!* alas! this is the very sort of words which Protestants consider superficial; good *as far as they go*, but nothing more."

From a Tract against the Purgatory of Romanism, we extract, in its own words,

The Oxford doctrine of Tradition.

". . . . What has been said will illustrate what is meant by Catholic Tradition, and how it may be received without binding us to accept every thing which the Fathers say. It must be *Catholic* to be of authority; that is, all the writers who mention the subject, must agree together in their view of it, or the exceptions, if there be any, must be such as *probare regulam*. And again, they must profess it *is* Traditionary teaching. For instance, supposing all the Fathers agreed together in their interpretation of a certain text, I consider that agreement would invest that interpretation with such a degree of authority, as to make it at first sight most rash (to say the very least) to differ from them: yet it is conceivable that on some points, as the interpretation of unfulfilled prophecy, they might be mistaken. It is abstractedly conceivable, that a modern commentator *might* on certain occasions plausibly justify his dissent from them:—this is conceivable, I say, *unless* they were explaining a doctrine of the creed, which is otherwise known to come from the Apostles, —or professed, (which would be equivalent) that such an interpretation had ever been received in their respective Churches as coming from the Apostles. Catholic Tradition is something more than Catholic teaching. Great as is the authority of the latter, (and we cannot well put it too high,) Tradition is something beyond it. This remark is in point here, for it might be objected that so many Fathers agree together in the notion of a last-day Purgatory, that, were it not for the accident of others speaking differently, we should certainly have received it as Catholic Tradition. I answer no; whatever the worth of so many witnesses would have been,—and it certainly for safety's sake ought to have been taken for very much,—still, Origen, Hilary, Ambrose, and the rest, do not approximate in their remarks to the authoritative language in which they would speak of the Trinity or the benefits of Baptism. They do not profess to be delivering an article of the Faith once delivered to the saints."

In a Tract (No. 73) on the introduction of rationalistic principles into religion, we are presented with two contrasted statements of the Theology of the Oxford, and of the Evangelical School. The doctrines of the Catholic Church, as Oxford calls itself, are these:

> " . . . The Holy Trinity; the Incarnation of the Eternal Son; His atonement and merits; the Church as the medium and instrument through which he operates on the world in the communication of them; the Sacraments and Sacramentals, (as Bishop Taylor calls them,) as the principal channels through which His merits are applied to individuals; Regeneration, the Communion of Saints, the Resurrection of the body, consequent upon their administration; and lastly, our faith and works, as a condition of the availableness and success of these divine appointments. Each of these doctrines is a Mystery; that is, each stands in a certain degree isolated from the rest, unsystematic, connected with the rest by unknown intermediate truths, and bearing upon subjects unknown. Thus the Atonement, *why* it was necessary, *how* it operates, is a Mystery; that is, the heavenly truth which is revealed, extends on each side of it into an unknown world. We see but the skirts of God's glory in it. The virtue of the Holy Communion; how it conveys to us the body and blood of the Incarnate Son crucified, and how by partaking it body and soul are made spiritual. The Communion of Saints; in what sense they are knit together into one body of which Christ is the head. Good works; how they, and how prayers again, influence our eternal destiny. In like manner, what our relation is to the innumerable company of Angels, some of whom, as we are told, minister to us; what to the dead in Christ, the spirits of the just perfected, who are ever joined to us in a heavenly communion; what bearing the Church has upon the fortunes of the world, or, it may be, the universe. * * *
>
> " Striking indeed is the contrast presented to this view of the Gospel, by the popular theology of the day! That theology is as follows;—that the Atonement is the chief doctrine of the Gospel;—again, that it is chiefly to be regarded, not as a wonder in heaven, and in its relation to the attributes of God and the unseen world, but in its experienced effects on our minds, in the change it effects where it is believed. On this, as on the horizontal line in a picture, all the portions of the Gospel system are placed and made to converge: as if it might fearlessly be used to regulate, adjust, correct, complete every thing else. Thus, the doctrine of the Incarnation is viewed as necessary and important to the Gospel, *because* it gives sacredness to the Atonement; of the Trinity, *because* it includes the revelation, not only of the Redeemer, but also of the Sanctifier, by whose aid and influence the Gospel message is to be blessed to us. It follows that faith is nearly the whole of religion, for through it the message or Manifestation is *received*; on the other hand, the scientific language of Catholicism is disparaged, as having no tendency to enforce the operation of the revelation of the Atonement on our minds, and the Sacraments are limited to the office of representing, and promising, and impressing on us the promise of divine influences, in no measure of conveying them. Thus the Dispensation is practically identified with its Revelation or rather Manifestation. Not that the

reality of the Atonement is formally denied, but it is cast in the back ground, except so far as it can be discovered to be influential, viz. to show God's hatred of sin, the love of Christ and the like; and there is an evident *tendency* to consider it as a *mere* Manifestation of the love of Christ, to the denial of all real virtue in it as an expiation for sin: as if his death took place, merely to show his love for us, as a sign of God's infinite mercy, to calm and assure us, without any *real* connexion existing between it and God's forgiveness of our sins. And the dispensation thus being hewn and chiselled into an intelligible human system, is represented, when thus mutilated, as affording a remarkable evidence of the truth of the Bible, an evidence level to the *reason*, and superseding the *testimony* of the Apostles. That is, according to the above observations, that Rationalism, or want of faith, which has first invented a spurious gospel, next looks complacently on its own offspring, and pronounces it to be the very image of that notion of the Divine Providence according to which it was originally modelled; a procedure, which, besides more serious objections, incurs the logical absurdity of arguing in a circle."

We rejoice to see it boldly and honestly denied by the Oxford School, that the doctrine of the Atonement has any thing to do with the elucidation of God's Justice. "It is *in no sense* a great and glorious manifestation of His *justice*, as men speak now a-days,"—"but Rationalism (i. e. Evangelicism,) would account for every thing." We are glad to find the pertinency of an example often cited, and among others, by one of the Clergymen engaged in the late Liverpool Controversy, very explicitly and logically refuted:

"They refer God's justice to the well-being of His creation, as *a final end*, as if it might in fact be considered a modification of benevolence. Accordingly, they say God's justice was satisfied by the Atonement, inasmuch as He could then pardon man consistently with the good of his creation; consistently with their salutary terror of His power and strictness; consistently with the due order of His Government. This should be carefully noted, as showing us the tendency of the Rationalistic principle under review towards Utilitarianism. The following passage is given in illustration, from the Essays of Mr. Scott, of Aston Sandford:—

"'The story of Zaleucus, prince of the Locrians, is well known; to show his abhorrence of adultery, and his determination to execute the law he had enacted, condemning the adulterer to the loss of both his eyes, and at the same time to evince his love to his son, who had committed that crime, he willingly submitted to lose one of his own eyes, and ordered at the same time, one of his son's to be put out! Now what adulterer could *hope to escape*, when *power was vested in* a man whom neither *self-love*, nor *natural affection* in its greatest force, could induce to dispense with the law, or relax the rigour of its sentence?'—Essay ix.

"True, this act would show intense energy of determination to uphold the existing laws, clearly enough; and so did Mucius Scævola show intense energy in burning off his hand; but what is this to the question of *justice*?"—No. 73, p. 30.

Mr. Erskine and Mr. Jacob Abbott are selected by the Oxford Tract Writers as glaring examples of the tendency of the popular Theology towards Rationalism, or the system of regarding Revelation as a *manifestation* rather than as a *mystery*. Mr. Abbott's "Corner Stone," the Oxford School distinctly says, "approaches within a hair's breadth of Socinianism." For our own part, we hope that the intervening hair will prove strong enough and broad enough to keep us asunder, for we have no wish to be identified with the maudling rationalism, the sick energies, of Mr. Abbott. The following illustration is given of the difference between regarding a doctrine as a *manifestation*, and as a mystery:—

"If we wish to express the sacred Mystery of the Incarnation accurately, we should rather say that God is man, than that man is God. Not that the latter proposition is not altogether Catholic in its wording, but the former expresses the *history* of the Economy, (if I may so call it) and confines our Lord's personality to His divine nature, making His manhood an adjunct; whereas to say that man is God, does the contrary of both of these,—leads us to consider him a man personally, with some vast and unknown dignity superadded, and that acquired of course after His coming into existence as man. The difference between these two modes of speaking is well illustrated in the recent work of a Socinian writer, whom on account of the truth and importance of his remarks, it is right, with whatever pain, to quote.

"'A quick child, though not acquainted with logic, . . . will perceive the absurdity of saying that Edward is John. . . . As the young pupil must be prepared to infer from the New Testament, that a perfect man is perfect God, he . . . . must be imperceptibly led to consider the word God as expressing a quality, or an aggregate of qualities, which may be predicted of more than one, as the name of a species; just as when we say John is man, Peter is man, Andrew is man. . . . . And so it is, with the exception of a few who, in this country, are still acquainted with that ingeniously perverse system of words, by means of which the truly scholastic Trinitarians (such as Bishop Bull and Waterland, who had accurately studied the fathers and the schoolmen,) appear to evade the logical contradictions with which the doctrine of the Trinity abounds; all, as I have observed for many years, take the word God, in regard to Christ, as the name of a species, and more frequently of a dignity.'—*Heresy and Orthodoxy*, p. 91."

The following passage from Mr. Abbott is extracted by the Oxford writer, as exhibiting the tendency to Socinianism of the religious school to which Mr. Abbott belongs:—

"'God is an unseen, universal power, utterly invisible to us, and imperceptible, except so far as He shall act out His attributes in what he does. *How shall He act out moral principle?* It is easy, by his material creation, to make any impression upon us, which material objects can make; but how shall He exhibit to us the moral beauty of justice, and benevolence, and mercy between man and man? . . . He might *declare* His moral attributes as He might have declared His power; but if he would bring home to us the one as vividly and distinctly as the other, He must act out his moral principles by a moral *manifestation*, in a moral scene: *and the great beauty of Christianity* is, that it represents him as doing so. He brings out the purity, and spotlessness, and moral glory of the Divinity, through the workings of a human mind, called into existence for this purpose, and stationed in a most conspicuous attitude among men . . . Thus the moral perfections of divinity show themselves to us in the only way by which, so far as we can see, it is possible directly to show them, by coming out in action, in the very field of human duty, by a mysterious union with a human intellect and human powers. It is God manifest in the flesh; *the visible moral image of an all-pervading moral Deity*, Himself for ever invisible.'—pp. 14, 15.

"On this explanation of the Incarnation, now, alas, not unpopular even in our own Church, viz. that 'God manifest in the flesh' is 'the *visible moral* image' of God, let us hear the judgment of one who was a Trinitarian, and has lately avowed Socinianism. He thus relates the change in his own religious profession:

"'In my anxiety to avoid a separation from the Church by the deliberate surrender of my mind to my old Unitarian convictions, I took refuge in a modification of the Sabellian theory, and availed myself of the moral unity which I believe to exist between God the Father and Christ, joined to the consideration that Christ is called in the New Testament the *Image* of God, and addressed my prayers to God *as appearing in that Image*. I left nothing untried to cultivate and encourage this feeling by devotional means. But such efforts of mere feeling (and I confess with shame their frequency on my part for the sake of what seemed most religious,) were always vain and fruitless. *Sooner or later my reason has not only frustrated but punished them.* In the last mentioned instance, the devout contrivance would not bear examination. *Sabellianism is only Unitarianism disguised in words*: and as for the worship of an image in its absence, the idea is most unsatisfactory. In this state, however, I passed five or six years; but the return to the clear and definite Unitarianism in which I had formerly been, was as easy as it was natural.'—*Heresy and Orthodoxy*, p. viii.

"This passage proves thus much, not that the philosophising in question *leads* to Socinianism, but that it is one under which Socinianism may *lie hid*, even from a man's own consciousness; and this is just the use I wish to make of it against Mr. Abbott."

The general reception of Mr. Abbott's works the Oxford Tract writer regards as a sign of the religious temper of the age.

How is it, he asks, that so many men professing strict religion, have embraced and dwelt on their statements without smelling the taint of death which is in them? That the Evangelical School can agree upon the merits of works, "which turn out to be all but Socinian," the Oxford writer considers as amounting to "a self convicted mischief in that view of Religion," which its upholders attempt to support by the aid of such books. In confirmation of this estimate of Mr. Abbott, and of the tendencies of his school, the Oxford Divine gives some quotations from a preface by Dr. Pye Smith, prefixed to one of Mr. Abbott's works republished in this country.

" 'Mr. Abbott has so much of originality in his manner of thinking, and of *unguarded simplicity* in his style of expression,' [as render a friendly editor useful.] 'There might be peril that, without such a precaution, some readers would take a premature alarm, when they found some essential doctrines of Christianity conveyed in *terms of simplicity*, and elucidated by very familiar analogies, which appear considerably removed from our accredited phraseology. . . . . *Whatever use we make of the language of the theological schools, we should never go beyond our ability to translate it into the plain speech of common life.*'

" As far as the words go, this means, when duly explained, though the writer could not of course intend it, that Mr. A.'s merit consists in having translated Trinitarianism into Socinianism. And that this is no unfair interpretation of the words, is plain from what presently follows, in which he speaks of the *prejudice* which the orthodox language and doctrine of divinity create against orthodoxy in the minds of those who are orthodox, *all but* receiving these orthodox statements. In other words, expressly specifying the Socinians, he requires us to adopt Mr. A.'s language, in order to reconcile them to us. I quote his words.

" 'But there is one department in the inseparable domain of theology and religion, upon Mr. Abbott's treatment of which I should be very blameable, were I to withhold my convictions. Among us, as well as in the New England States, there is a body, large and respectable if considered absolutely, but far from large when viewed in comparison with the numbers of other professed Christians. It consists of those who disbelieve the doctrines held, as to their essential principles, by all other Christian denominations, with respect to the way in which sinful, guilty, degraded mankind may regain the favour of God, and the pure felicity of the world to come;—the doctrines of a divine Saviour, His assumption of our nature, His propitiation and righteousness, and the restoration of holiness and happiness by his all-gracious Spirit. This class of persons is treated, by some public men, and in some influential writings, chiefly periodical, with scorn and contumely, and are held up to hatred, not to say persecution: they are continually represented as blasphemers and infidels, alike dangerous to the state, and inimical to all vital religion. Hence, thousands of excellent persons, deriving their only knowledge from the source to which I have alluded, regard this portion of their neighbours with horror, never think of treating them with tenderness, never attempt to obtain a lodgment for truth and holy affections in their hearts. Ah, little think these well meaning persons, &c. . . . . The circumstances of my life have put me into a condition of more correctly knowing this class of our fellow professors of Christianity ; I know that there are among them serious, thoughtful, amiable persons, whose minds are prepossessed with prejudices against us and our system, much to the same extent as we are against them and theirs. I know, not merely how they reason, but how they feel. They in general have extremely erroneous conceptions of the orthodox system of faith. They have imbibed those misconceptions in early years : and subsequent circumstances have contributed to strengthen them. For some of those circumstances, of no trivial power to confirm prejudice, we have to blame ourselves. This is a state of things full of mischief and danger. Surely it is a pressing duty to do all that we can for clearing away the clouds of ignorance and misrepresentation which, with so dire effect, discolour and distort the objects seen through them. For this purpose, it is to me a heartfelt pleasure to say that Mr. Abbott's "Corner Stone" is admirably adapted. Notions producing feelings, and those feelings of deep and wide activity in the formation of religious sentiments, have been derived from Pelagius, Socinus, and Episcopius, from Clarke, Law, and Watson, from Lardner, Priestley, and Channing; and it is the thoroughly pervading influence on the mind of those mutually acting feelings and sentiments, which produces all that is formidable in the theoretical objections, and much of that which is effective in the practical repugnance, which are entertained by many against the doctrines of grace and holiness, through the Atonement and the Spirit of Christ. How desirable to meet those feelings in their germinating principle; to anticipate those sentiments, by the dissolution of the causes which would form them. This is what our author has done. His *reasonings and illustrations upon the personal and official attributes* of our Lord and Saviour, are such as may be compared to the *correctness of anatomical knowledge, the delicacy of touch, and the astonishing preciseness of applying the probe and the knife, which we admire in the first surgeons of the age.*'

"A correct and memorable witness indeed, to the kind of treatment offered by these religionists to Him, whom, after His exposure on the cross, His true disciples reverently 'took down,' and 'wrapped in fine linen,' and 'laid in a sepulchre wherein never man before was laid.'

"I will conclude by summing up in one sentence, which must be pardoned me, if in appearance harsh, what the foregoing discussion is intended to show. There is a widely spread, though variously admitted School of doctrine among us, within and without the Church, which intends and professes peculiar piety, as directing its attention to the *heart itself*, not to any thing external to us, whether creed, actions, or ritual. I do not hesitate to assert, that this doctrine is based upon error, that it is really a specious form of trusting man rather than God, that it is in its nature Rationalistic, and that it tends to Socinianism. How the individual supporters of it will act as time goes on, is another matter,—the good will be separated from the bad; but the School, as such, will pass through Sabellianism, to that 'god-denying Apostacy,' to use the ancient phrase, to which in the beginning of its career it professed to be especially opposed."—Vol. III. p. 53.

In opposition to the Evangelical School, its view of doctrine, its modes of teaching, and its supposed tendencies, the Oxford School announces the principle of "*reserve* in communicating religious knowledge." In opposition to the prevalent Evangelical practice of preaching the doctrine of the Atonement upon all occasions, and offering it as a saving remedy to all minds, the Oxford party have issued one of their largest Tracts, containing an inquiry, "whether there is not in God's dealings with mankind, a very remarkable holding back of sacred and important truths, as if the knowledge of them were injurious to persons unworthy of them." In this Tract there is a great deal of important truth, and of refined sentiment, but still it is produced only for the sake of aiding a Church purpose, and of establishing the necessity for some *authoritative* Teaching and Discipline, to repress the rudeness and vulgarity of a popular School. It is ingeniously argued, that our Lord's command to his disciples, not to declare who he was, was an instance of this "reserve," and that its final cause was, to prevent the aggravation of guilt which would have attached to his rejection, if he had manifested himself with a more overpowering evidence.

"All these things tend to confirm the supposition, that our Lord's manifesting himself was accompanied with very great and singular danger, and this is borne out by expressions such as these, 'If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin;' and 'If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin;' and we know that the places of our Lord's peculiar abode, and the scene of his mighty works, Capernaum and Bethsaida, were brought into a condition so fearful, that as to the former, it will be more tolerable for Sodom in the day of judgment. If, therefore, such great guilt was incurred by witnessing our Saviour's miracles and preaching, may we not reasonably suppose that the withholding the full evidence of his power was in mercy intended to keep them back from so awful a state? It may also be observed, that persons who come before us as most accepted, are those who have had least advantages, the Centurion, the Canaanitish woman, the good Samaritan, the returning leper, (also a Samaritan,) the thief on the cross; on the contrary, the Levite in the parable, is only not so bad as the priest; out of those admitted nearest to our Lord the Judas is found."—Vol. IV. p. 16.

This "reserve" in communicating religious truth to minds not prepared to receive it, is supposed to be in harmony with the representations which moralists give of vice and virtue, as states of Darkness and Light, their moral condition being, in fact, their aptitude for, and affinity with, new spiritual communications. This description of our moral nature is supposed to be confirmed by Scripture, "where sin is frequently spoken of by expressions which imply the light within being darkened," and progressive holiness is continually alluded to as progress in knowledge, and to know God as the end of all Christian obedience. The strength of ungoverned passion, ending in a total want of control, is emphatically called "adding drunkenness to thirst," and the want of spiritual discernment is termed "a book that is sealed."

In the same way, the knowledge which is supposed in morals to be the result of a good life, and which is "reserved" from all others, is something which is of a nature very great and infinite.

"*It is of a moral, and not of an intellectual nature.*

"The next point to be observed is that this hidden wisdom is entirely of a moral nature, and independent of any mere cultivation of the intellect. Indeed the latter of itself would appear to be a hindrance to it, —for such 'knowledge puffeth up.' Even Aristotle cautions us that knowledge in morals can only be gained by practice. And that heavenly knowledge, of which St. Paul speaks, he is cautious of disclosing to those who are carnally minded. 'Add to virtue knowledge,' says St. Peter; and this knowledge he considers as the very end of obedience. 'If these things (i. e. these graces) abound in you, they will make that ye shall not be unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ.' (2 Pet. i. 8.) It was seeing that he would command his family to keep the ordinances of God, which was the reason given why God would not withhold from Abraham the thing which He did. And indeed the character of this knowledge in all its fulness, its secret and hidden,—its vast and infinite nature, and its being entirely a matter of moral attainment, is sufficiently expressed in our blessed Lord's own words—'Judas saith unto Him, (not Iscariot,) Lord, how is it that thou wilt manifest Thyself unto us and not unto the world? Jesus answered, and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.' It might also be considered that holiness in man is, in fact, nothing else but a sense of the Divine presence; to improve in holiness, therefore, is to grow in the consciousness of God's presence. And would again bring us to the same point, i. e. our blessed Saviour revealing himself according to the state of each man's heart."

Now, in the same way that in morals only those who do His will, "know" of the doctrine, and that "the secret of the Lord is with them that fear Him," it is supposed by the Oxford

Theology that of this kind are the doctrines which divide Christians, such as the subjects of faith and works, of the free grace of God, and obedience on the part of man. "They seem to be left in Scripture in a way to give rise to all these disputations among (if I may so speak) the multitude who are without."—"May not all these difficulties be like those of the Jews, who knew that no good thing could be born of Nazareth, or like that which they deem to have suggested to startle the Disciples, 'that Elias must first come?' For in *all* these things we seem to have Jesus of Nazareth going about still among us—hiding himself from the many who are engaged in factious disputations concerning him, or busied with their worldly views, but here and there he is in secret disclosed and acknowledged." God and Christ are represented as still concealing themselves in the "reserve" that is natural to good men. The instances that are given are, with respect to one of them at least, the *Royal Martyr*, extraordinary examples by which to illustrate the ways of God:

> "The circumstance I allude to is such as this; it is mentioned of James Bonnel, that he was of great 'retiredness of spirit;' 'solitariness of spirit,' is mentioned of George Herbert; he seems to have felt, as it were, an unseen hand pulling him back. The same is noticed of Robert Nelson, and of Thomas à Kempis, whose book is full of this spirit; a similar sacred reserve was the characteristic of Charles the 1st. Instances of this kind might probably be adduced respecting all such characters. Pascal says, 'This wonderful mystery, impenetrable to any mortal eye, under which God is pleased to shade His glories, may excite us powerfully to a love of solitude and silence, and of retirement from the view of the world.'"

We are tempted to extract, although it is of considerable length, the whole passage in which the operation of this principle of reserve on the individual religious character is traced. We do this for two reasons; first, because we spoke of the greater refinement of feeling which distinguish the Oxford from the Evangelical School; and secondly, because it will introduce to the objections felt by the Oxford Ecclesiastics to the coarser and more popular, the "unreserved" modes of address adopted by the Evangelical Clergy.

That Christ, as seen in the conduct of good men, conceals himself.

> "In the second place, there is another circumstance, which would tend to produce the same effect, viz. that reserve, or retiring delicacy, which exists naturally in a good man, unless injured by external motives, and which is of course the teaching of God through him. Some-

thing of this kind always accompanies all strong and deep feeling, so much so that indications of it have been considered the characteristic of genuine poetry, as distinguishing it from that which is only fictitious of poetic feeling. It is the very protection of all sacred and virtuous principle, and which, like the bloom which indicates life and freshness, when once lost cannot be restored. Which is thus expressed in a Latin hymn;

> ' Se sub serenis vultibus
> Austera virtus occulit:
> Timet videri; ne suum,
> Dum prodit, amittat decus.'
>
> Paris. Brev. Comm. Mul.

Such a reserve on other subjects of sublime or delicate feeling is only a type of the same in religion; where, of course, from the very nature of the subject, it must be much greater, inasmuch as it comprehends all feelings and all conduct which are directed to Him who is invisible, and who reads the language of the heart, and to whom silence may often best speak. Every thing which has God for its end gives rise to feelings which do not admit of expression. This seems to be implied in the difference which Aristotle speaks of, when he says there are objects which are worthy of higher feelings than praise can express, and such we look upon with honour and veneration. We do, indeed, often speak of such with words of praise, as we do of the Supreme Being, but in so doing we stand upon lower ground, and rather turn to each other than to Him, and introduce relation and comparison, which necessarily must be drawn from human and inferior objects: but we then descend from the higher, but silent, impressions of awe, veneration, and wonder. Such, for instance, are those with which we first contemplate a vast religious edifice, or some grand object in nature. When these first feelings subside, we express ourselves in praise, and, necessarily, have recourse to comparison or contrast. Hence it was the case in the primitive times of Christianity, that the feelings of devotion were expressed by significant actions, which spoke, as it were, a secret language: such was the custom of turning to the East, and the use of the sign of the Cross. For ' Curæ leves loquuntur, ingentes stupent,' those who feel deeply are pained by the lighter expressions of others.

" When that reserve is cast aside, there is a want of true and deep feeling; and this may be seen in the rejection of strong, typical, and figurative, and, therefore, half-secret expressions with which deep feeling is apt to clothe itself. Thus, in early periods of a nation, when their sense of the great and marvellous is strongest, they make use of those terms or modes of speech, which partake more of the infinite and divine; and their language, as they become more civilized, will partake more of the character of what is earthly and human. They adopt what they think is more full expressions of their meaning; but the fact is, that they are general expressions, and therefore more limited and finite, and such as indicate rather a straining after such strong feeling, which they have not, than an expression of it. An instance of this may be seen in the rejection of the Ancient Psalms for modern paraphrases of the same. In the former, an infinite meaning was opened to the eye of faith: in the latter, it is tied down to one feeble human interpretation. Instances of the same may be seen in the New Version compared with the Old. May not one reason why Scripture, and our Lord Himself, uses figurative and proverbial expressions be on account of their comprehensiveness, and the extent of application which they bear?

"In addition to such holy reserve, and the suggestions of humility, another circumstance, which tends to produce the effect here described, are the commands of Holy Scripture, which enjoin the concealment of religious actions. Now, considering that actions teach more than words, and living examples more than maxims and admonitions, this immediately removes from the sight of men the most powerful appeals of God, and evidences of his presence; for all the most purely religious actions are thus withdrawn from view, done from God only, who is in secret, and to Him only, who seeth in secret, they begin and end in Him alone, unknown to the world. These are the signs of God's presence among us, and of His withholding that presence from the gaze of the multitude, as too pure and holy for us to look on, and covering those that seek Him in the shadow of His hand. So that in the lives of those, in whom Christ dwells, there is ever something remarkably analogous to the retiring actions of His own life; and the state of such persons, while on earth, no words can express so emphatically as those of Scripture, *their 'life is hid with Christ in God.'*

"Now, it is much to be observed, that these indications, which are found with good men, and increase with holiness of life, and by which we may learn the mode in which the Holy Spirit is dealing with mankind, are not to be found in religious enthusiasm. I would mean by enthusiasm, a state of the mind when the feelings are strongly moved by religion, but the heart is not adequately purified nor humbled. Such, therefore, would be most likely to occur when the passions have been strengthened by an irregular life, and the objects that excited them are casually removed from view, and the importance of religion is in consequence seen and felt. Such a state would partake much of the nature of earthly passion, and would be such as might be called in morals, according to the view taken above, a state of ignorance. God is not apprehended, as He is set forth in Scripture, as of infinite holiness, but a fiction of the imagination, as each man feigns the idea of God according to his own heart, which was shown visibly in the idols of old, and alluded to in the expression, 'Thou thoughtest wickedly that God was such an one as thyself.' In such a case men would have no reserve in expressing that which was not at all rightly apprehended, or feared, or loved. And the cause of this state of heart would be a not keeping the commandments which give this light to the eyes, or the not having kept them, and such transgressions not having been repented of. For this is set before us as the great cure for enthusiasm by St. John. It is the Apostle of Divine Love who seems to have been especially commissioned to warn us against this its counterfeit. Not only in his Epistles, but, in recording the parting consolations of our Lord, no less than eleven times in the course of two chapters does he stop, as it were, to insert these cautions, 'If ye keep my commandments.' So that it would be exactly the case with these, as with those heretics of whom Tertullian speaks, as having none of that discipline of secret reserve which the Church maintained: 'All things,' he says, 'are with them free, and without restraint.' 'They have no fear of God, because God is not among them; for where God is, there must be the fear of Him.' (Tertullian de Præscript. Hæreticorum.) And yet, of course, the effect of this would be a strong contagious influence, after the usual manner of all earthly passion.

"Religion does not, under such circumstances, produce its genuine effect of humbling the natural man. To have a knowledge of God, without a knowledge of our own guilt and misery, has (as Pascal mentions) the effect of puffing up. And there is a great deal in religion which the natural man may eagerly take hold of, in order to exalt himself. Here, therefore, there would not be humility drawing back into the shade, as in the former instance; nor would there be that delicacy, or modest reserve in the outward expression of feeling; because there would be rather an aiming after the persuasion, than any really deep and true sense of religion.* On the contrary, a mind in this state by strong expressions would be endeavouring to persuade itself, and to persuade others, in order that, through their opinion, it may again in return persuade itself of its having that sense. And this would account for that deceit which, as Bp. Butler observes, so often accompanies religious enthusiasm; first of all deceiving itself into a false apprehension, and then, in order to support this, deceiving others; and then others, without this self-delusion, as its end.

"The third characteristic in holiness of life is also here wanting; *i. e.* a self-denying and consistent performance of religious duties in secret. For such obedience would clearly remove it; and, therefore, this would account for another circumstance which characterizes religious enthusiasm, and that is unsettledness and inconsistency,—a state of ever learning, and never coming to the knowledge of the truth; which, of course, arises from not seeking for it by obedience, which, we are told, is a sure way of arriving at it. The actions it does perform are rather the extraordinary, than the ordinary actions of religion, so as to lose that reserve before mentioned: and for the same reason, it delights in actions of a purely religious character, more than in those, in which the religious motive is concealed in the actions of daily life."—*Tract*, No. 80, p. 57.

We now proceed to the principles and practices of popular Orthodoxy which are in violation of this principle of "reserve," which the Oxford School hold in such reverence. And first, is objected to that new principle of the Evangelical Clergy, in the form not only of an Article of Faith, but as the one and only Article, dispensing with the Sacraments, the Creeds, the

---

* "Something of this kind has been observed to characterize attempts in poetry.",

Liturgies, the Church discipline; "and this principle is, that the highest and most sacred of all Christian doctrines, is to be brought before, and pressed home to, all persons indiscriminately, and most especially to those who are leading unchristian lives." Another violation of the principle of "reserve" is one that will sound strange in Evangelical ears,—namely, that "so far from its being considered necessary to keep persons from church on account of irreligious lives, it is usually thought that every thing is done, if they can be brought to it." Another violation of the principle of religious delicacy of feeling according to the Oxford School, is the ostentatious building of Churches, for those who have no desire to enter them; the indiscriminate distribution of Bibles and religious publications; the importance attached to pulpit eloquence; liturgies made suitable to the taste of the generality; canonical honours relinquished for those which are more popular; sacred things brought out of their chaste reserve, and put forth to attract;* and lastly, the inculcation of mere scriptural knowledge in national schools to unprepared minds, without adequately instilling a sense of its practical importance.

There is an important admission of the correctness of an Unitarian interpretation, now made by the Oxford School, in prosecution of its dislike of the vulgar use of the doctrine of the Atonement by the Evangelical Clergy. "The prevailing notion of bringing forward the Atonement *explicitly* and *prominently* on all occasions," Oxford declares to be, "quite opposed to the teaching of Scripture, nor do we find any sanction for it in the Gospels. *If* the Epistles of St. Paul *appear* to favour it, it is only at first sight." When Paul speaks of himself as preaching at all times "CHRIST crucified," the Oxford Theologians declare *now*, what Unitarian writers have long declared, but hitherto with no assent from Churchmen, that this has no connexion whatever with the Atonement. "It is a great mistake," say they, "to suppose that by preaching the Atonement, we are preaching what St. Paul meant by CHRIST crucified."

". . . . It may be seen by an attention to the context in all the passages where these expressions occur, that it is a very different view, and in fact, the opposite to the modern notion, which St. Paul always intends by it. It is the necessity of our being crucified to the world, it is our humiliation together with Him, mortification of the flesh, being made conformable to His sufferings and His death. It was a doctrine which was 'foolishness to the wise and an offence to the Jew,' on account of the abasement of the natural man which it implied. Whereas, the notion now prevailing is attractive to the world, in the naked way in which it is put forth, so as rather to diminish, than increase, a sense of responsibility and consequent humiliation. If the doctrine of the Atonement is conveyed in the expression of Christ crucified, as used by St. Paul, it is by teaching, at the same time, the necessity of our mortification, which is repugnant to opinions now received. It is expressing, in other words, our Saviour's declaration, 'he that cometh after me must take up his cross daily and follow me.' They both imply that we cannot approach God without a sacrifice,—a sacrifice on the part of human nature in union with that of our Saviour."

---

* Tracts for the Times, Vol. IV. p. 69.

Finally, to require as is sometimes done, from both grown persons and children, an explicit declaration of a belief in the Atonement, and the full assurance of its powers, appears to the Oxford School completely untenable. For if, in the case of Abraham and many others of the most approved faith, there was no such knowledge, it may be the case now; and "there might have been many a helpless person, who knelt to a crucifix in a village churchyard, who might have done so under a more true sense of that faith which is unto life, than those who are able to express the most enlightened knowledge."

We should give a fuller welcome to these admissions respecting the tendencies, and the Scriptural authority, of the popular preaching of the Atonement, were it not that, like all other admissions from the same quarter, they are made mainly for the sake of ushering in the SACRAMENTS and the PRIEST.

We had intended to give some account of two of the most important works that have been called out, in opposition to the Oxford Theology, "Antient Christianity" by the Author of the "Natural History of Enthusiasm," and "Tradition Unveiled," by the Rev. Baden Powell. We must be content, merely to indicate the nature of their respective arguments.

The first of these works has most of the faults, and not in a striking degree, the merits of the author's usual style. It has his great vagueness and diffuseness, and want of logic, and not the force of expression which in his other works does something to redeem these defects. The argument he maintains against the Primitive Church as an AUTHORITY, is founded upon "a glaring instance" of corruption, upon the subject of celibacy, found in connexion with the very Earliest Fathers. A Church confessedly corrupt in any one point, can be an AUTHORITY in no other. If it is corrupt in one, it *may* be corrupt in all. Where there is a selection to be made, and a separation of what is good from what is bad, an act of judgment is required to make the separation, and the principle of AUTHORITY is evidently abandoned. This is a very clear, practical, and telling, "ad hominem," argument; but it does not go to the root of the matter, and it leads the author into some very unprofitable details of the morbid anatomy of Ecclesiastics. We shall give the pith of his mode of reasoning in one or two quotations.

> "At a time not more remote from the Apostolic age, than we, of this generation, are from the times of Barrow, Tillotson, Taylor, Baxter, we find all the *elements* of the abuses of the twelfth century, and not the elements only, but most of those abuses in a ripened, nay, in a putrescent condition." "In truth, if we are thinking of the preservation of morality at large, or of the purity of the church in particular, I could not for my own part, hesitate to prefer the tremendous irreversible vows, and the dungeon monasteries of later times, to the loose fanatical profligacy of the times of Cyprian. *If we are to hear much more of the purity of the early church, there will be no choice left but to quote Cyprian and Tertullian, without retrenchment.*" "But now, you will say, all this is mere popery; and what have we to do with its superstitions, or with the impious frauds that were perpetrated to give them credit? What we have to do with these things is this—to retrace the course of time, a thousand years, or nearly as much, and there and then to discover, *in the bosom of the pristine and martyr church,* not perhaps the very same forms, usages, frauds, follies; but those substantial elements of religious opinion, and of moral sentiment, which gave support to all these abominations, and apart from which they would never have had existence. This then is the gist of our present argument—that there is absolutely nothing *in the ripe popery of the times of St. Dominic* (certain elaborate modes of proceeding excepted) *which is not to be found in the Christianity of the times of Cyprian or of Tertullian."—Ancient Christianity,* p. 70—3.

Professor Powell's work is a more fundamental Examination of the nature, pretensions, and tendency of Authoritative Teaching in the Church. He shows with entire success that Tradition to be authoritative must be supported by the same evidence that gives authority to any other supposed revelation,—that if Tradition is of equal authority with Scripture, the Traditionists must be at least equally inspired, and prepared to support their revelations by an external evidence of the same nature as that which supports Scripture itself. Here then is the dilemma, either Tradition is not of co-ordinate authority with Scripture; or if it is, the boundary line between what is Christianity and what is not, is completely removed; where the Revelation is to be found becomes a matter of uncertainty; and faith is no longer a conviction but a feeling; no longer possessing the character of Truth built on evidence,—but merely of enthusiasm proceeding on vague reverence. "Truth," says Mr. Powell, "implies conviction, and conviction evidence: a mere impression on the feelings or imagination requires neither. A faith founded on conviction and evidence claims the character of truth, a religion of mere reverence and submission owns no connexion with truth. A system which discards evidence puts truth and fable on the same level. That which is treated as if it were fiction, will soon come to be regarded as such: that which has no better warrant than an appeal to veneration and antiquity, is undistinguishable from fiction. The *real* question is not one *of the revival of Popery,* but of the PRESERVATION OF THE VERY FOUNDATIONS OF FAITH;—whether religion shall be made to depend on the indulgence of feeling or the conviction of reason;—whether Christianity is based on fable or fact, on antiquity or truth. To a simple believer in the written word of the New Testament, *the system of tradition* can appear in no other light than as *involving in entire ambiguity the landmarks of Christian truth.* It *does away* by rendering *confused,* all distinctive characteristics of a *definite depository,* and *finally closed record of revelation.* By *neutralizing,* it *destroys* the whole evidence of the Gospel."

On a review of the whole subject we expect great advantages to TRUTH to be the result of the Oxford Theology. It has made some fundamental *admissions,* which coming from the highest authorities in this country, for philology and ecclesiastical research, can now never be withdrawn, and would vainly be refused by any of the less instructed Schools of Orthodoxy. The highest authorities for learning in these countries *have made the acknowledgments,* that the Bible declares not its own inspiration, and teaches no formularies of faith, that the doctrine of the Trinity is not declared there, that the Deity of the Holy Ghost does not appear there, that original Sin is only obscurely alluded to, that the Deity of Jesus is not the teaching of the Gospels, and that the whole tone of the New Testament is not ritual, not Sacramental. This is neither more nor less than an avowal of *Scriptural* Unitarianism; an avowal that *Orthodoxy* is not Scriptural, but Traditional. All these admissions have been made with the view of showing the timid but determined of the orthodox, that there is no way of that orthodoxy which they prize so much, except by consenting to receive it from the Authority of Tradition. The Unitarians and the Oxford School agree upon certain fundamental Scriptural *facts*; the Unitarians use these facts to establish private judgment and universal liberty of conscience,—the Oxford School uses them to establish Ecclesiastical Authority, and universal submission. There can be no doubt which will finally prevail,—and that the Oxford admissions are an important step towards progress. When we are told by Ecclesiastics themselves that there is no middle way between *subjection to a Church,* and the absolute liberty of individual judgment,—there can be little doubt these are not the times when men will voluntarily take upon their necks the Church yoke. If orthodox Protestantism has no foundation but this,—then as soon as this is seen, and Oxford is striving to make it seen, nothing is left but to become Rational Protestants,—protesting against Church Tyranny of any kind. Oxford has done admirable service to the cause of religious freedom, by demonstrating the absurdity of "popular Protestantism,"—of men upholding the principle of "the Bible only"—and yet distinguishing themselves as the "*only* orthodox"—and calling others Heretics who draw their Christianity from "the Bible only." If "the Bible only," is the standard, how dares any man, says the Oxford Divine, set up a *church* standard; and in addition to this *only* Authority, have *another* Authority *somewhere else?* It is really a puzzling question. We see nothing for it, but that all those resolved to have *dogmatic standards* should give in their allegiance to Oxford or to Rome. There is certainly "*no middle way,*" between admitting every man's right to interpret the Bible for himself, and the abject submission to "Authoritative Teaching in the Church," with the uncomfortable feeling, however, that the "Authority" is *not proved,* is at least as *unsettled,* as any man's private judgment or opinions can be. To be sent for certainty to an uncertain standard, uncertain both in its foundations as an authority, and in its teachings as an oracle, is a mockery, and a cruelty.

We cannot better express our own sentiments than by adopting the free words and thoughts with which Professor Powell closes his able and honest pamphlet.

> "The dubious twilight of mystical devotion, and the vague apprehension of *unrevealed mysteries,* surely cannot but seem greatly at variance with the very nature of Christianity, to those who regard it as fully and finally disclosed in the written word. If it be a plain announcement of the way of salvation, as such it must stand out alone, and apart from all doubtful speculations. If it be viewed as a simple declaration of necessary practical truths, addressed to the apprehensions and convictions of all, according to the light given them, to however small an extent the truth is made known, it is, so far, *distinctly* made known. It may present but a limited region to the view: but that view, as far as it does extend, is clear and cloudless. All beyond it is, and must be, enveloped in impenetrable darkness. But that which *is* disclosed is perspicuous and undisguised: and with this *alone* it is that we are concerned; with what may be hidden from us we have nothing to do. Religion to us *exists* only so far as it is *clearly revealed*; the acknowledgment of this

upon its proper evidence is faith; the *suspicion* that there *may be* something beyond, with which we are yet concerned, is the spirit of mysticism."

"To follow steadfastly what we are *assured* is the truth, and to shun as carefully what we *know* to be sinful, is rational religion:—to grope after what we *imagine may be* acceptable, and to tremble in the dark *lest* every step *should* be wrong, is superstition."

"And further, if all the complex system of authority be essential to the orthodox faith, may it not well be objected, Is this like any thing which can claim the appellation of the Gospel of Christ? or be received by the simple believer as a charter of grace and immortality? May it not be reasonably objected, In such uncertainty can there be discovered any positive announcement of the divine will? in such perplexity any sure guide to revealed truth? in such mysterious obscurity any thing which can be called a divine revelation at all?"

"In the writings of the New Testament we admit the absence of any *precise literal code* of doctrines or duties: yet we find the real elements of both: not indeed creeds but comprehensive truths; not systematic laws, but practical principles and motives. There is manifest, throughout, a plea of truth, and an appeal to evidence, and consequently an appeal to the *convictions* of all readers; and no authority can force conviction; in its nature, it must be free, or it ceases to be conviction. Thus, though there neither is, nor can be, consistently with the New Testament, any authority to decide what is true doctrine, and what is heresy, or to claim spiritual dominion over *others*, yet as all real faith is grounded on conviction, there does and must exist in every man, fallible as he is, such a power to determine the truth for *himself*; not merely as a right, but as a duty; not merely as a privilege but as an obligation. His own conscientious conviction, imperfect as it *may* be, but *free* as it *must* be, exercised according to the best of the ability given him, whether great or small, thus becomes *sacred* to *him*. It is that by which he must be guided in the most intimate connexion with his own personal responsibility; *not* a responsibility (as has been unintelligibly contended) of the *understanding*, but of the *will*, to preserve the honest use of the understanding. And if the inevitable *varieties* of private judgment be objected, as inconsistent with the *unity* and invariableness of truth,—I reply,—truth is indeed *one* and *invariable*, but it not only may, but must, be seen under *different aspects*, and with *different degrees of clearness* by different minds. To each it is realized, as far as the nature of the case permits, if he seek and receive it honestly to the *best* of his ability; not resting satisfied in any attainment, but continually striving to advance and improve. The measure of that ability, and the light vouchsafed, may be more or less. Christianity looks only to an improvement *proportional* to the means granted; a constantly progressive *advance*. It assures the disciple that increase of grace and light will always be given if properly sought,—that every one has enough given him to profit by,—to judge for *himself*, but not to *judge others*."—*Tradition Unveiled*, pp. 75—77.

And this admirably reasoned Rationalism comes from an Oxford Clergyman, and an Oxford Professor! There is no reputation at Oxford higher than that of Professor Powell. There are two things left in no doubt; that Church Uniformity is a practical falsehood: and that the tendency of Authoritative Teaching in the Church is to prepare the way out of the Church for religious Liberty, and Rational Christianity.

J. H. T.

ART. II.—PICTORIAL SHAKSPERE.

A MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S DREAM.

THE opinion is gaining ground that many (according to Mr. G. Lamb *all*) of Shakspere's plays lose effect in representation. Upon analogous grounds a writer in No. 269 of the Athenæum ably contends, that the pictorial embodying of some characters, in the plays already published by Mr. Knight, unsettle the conceptions which the lovers of Shakspere have derived from his verbal pictures. *I*, (namely the writer of the fragmentary articles on the Pictorial Shakspere, which have appeared in the *Christian Teacher*—*I*, who tired of that eternal *We* of Reviewers, henceforth renounce my former plurality)—I have for many years entertained an opinion varying from the former only in the extent of its application; but in regard to the Pictorial Shakspere, entirely agree with the writer in the Athenæum. The representation of such compositions as the Tempest, and the one before us, may if assisted by great display, amuse as a show: but the true lover of poetry cannot by this means be satisfied for the loss of his own conceptions of the personages. In the Tragedies and historical plays the enthusiastic admirer of their author may find it difficult to accommodate his own visions to the definite shapes he sees on the stage; he will at first dislike so see his Macbeth, his Hamlet, his Lear, incarnate in a Kemble, a Kean, or a Macready. There may be some loss in this process; but it cannot extend to many. A small number of privileged minds may, by the mere study of the compositions themselves, have approached to the Poet's creations; but it is absurd to suppose that the mass, even of the able, and educated, suffer any loss whatever by the adoption of the pictures which come to them reflected from the mind of a great actor.

On the other hand, I am obliged to confess that the pictorial versions of heroes and heroines, especially those placed in the title-pages as if to take an early possession of the reader, have given me no small disturbance. Those men in armour and those ladies in a metallic head-dress, for which I know no name, though probably my next door *Modiste* would laugh at my ignorance, stand so stiffly between me and my visions of Shakspere, that I turn away from Mr. Harvey's figures with a degree of fear. I do not intend to undervalue the talents of that celebrated artist; and willingly acknowledge myself an incompetent judge of art, except in its connection with poetry. It is alone in this relation I venture to observe that in the present case the artist has not drawn from Shakspere, but from the theatre. His ancient warriors and hunters are ready to split; his heroic beauties become formidable by their length of limb, and angularity of features. No: I had much rather keep my own airy, undefined Beauties. I heartily join in the feelings and adopt the words of the writer in the *Athenæum*: "though we admit the general merit of Mr. Harvey's designs, we feel grieved and annoyed that he should have presumed to substitute his crude pencil realities for our own beautiful imaginings; . . . we could not pourtray them ourselves, even had we his facility of hand, for there are idealities whose existence is perilled when we attempt to embody them."

It is indeed in respect to the ideal of BEAUTY that every one who has studied this subject must perceive the superiority of pure poetry over dramatic representation and that which is obtained through the Arts of Design. True Beauty seems to have no real outline, but rather to melt, as it were, in the indefinite, the infinite. The highest works of painting and sculpture (it would appear to me) produce their wonderful effects as symbols, not as realities. In the act of looking at them, and when our vision seems to absorb all our other powers, we are constantly turning the mind's eye within us in search of a more perfect image than that which is stamped on our retina. This dissatisfaction with every definite representation of beauty, is not occasioned by the artistical representations of painful or impassioned emotion. When we examine the group of the Laocoon we feel in proportion as we dwell minutely on the expression of every muscle, not only of the faces but of the different bodies. Here, motion as modifying form is the alphabet and dictionary of the language of feeling, a language which we understand more accurately in proportion as we examine its symbolical characters. Pure beauty is a mere existence which does not allow this kind of analysis.

That absence of beauty or perfection, which by a most secret contrast with the ideal of what an object ought, or was intended to be, is the source of the *Ridiculous*, may be admirably expressed in painting. The reason appears to me obvious: the effect, in similar cases, is produced by *definiteness*. Here outline is all powerful. No mere description of a ludicrous peculiarity can produce the effect of good mimicry, or humorous drawing. Nor is this confined to the broadly ludicrous; that delicate Comic, on the contrary, which arises from mere peculiarities, especially from such shades of character as we irresistibly connect with certain imperfections in the figure and countenance, is the proper field of humorous painting. Much as Mr. Dickens owes to his great talents, we still consider him very fortunate in his pictorial commentators. Had Cervantes (to whose genius that of Mr. Dickens as it appears in the Pickwick Papers, has a remarkable analogy) lived in an age of Lithography, and associated himself with a Spanish artist who could catch the likenesses of the ideal personages which people the Quixotic world, its author would not have met with the stupid opposition which for some years annoyed him and endangered the success of his work.[*] But the illustrative prints which appeared some time after, in multitudes, generally failed of conveying the true ideal of Don Quixote. This is indeed the universal fault of the prints and paintings relative to the Knight errant of La Mancha. He appears as a broad caricature; but, notwithstanding a few waverings of the mind of Cervantes, it is evident that he did not conceive his Don Quixote as a thing to mock. There is an elevation in his madness, which only the vulgar mind, whether of a *Maritornes* or a Duchess could fail to mark and respect. Both Don Quixote and Mr. Pickwick are enthusiastic lovers of virtue; both are ready to sacrifice themselves for its sake; both maintain a constant struggle against oppression and injustice; and both are equally ignorant of their respective worlds. But though we heartily laugh at their absurdities, we cannot but love and admire them. It would have been a misfortune for Mr. Dickens if Mr. Pickwick had appeared such a broad caricature as artists have generally made Don Quixote; but the figure of that moral Don Quixote, as it first meets our eyes addressing the club, is perfect. When we have read his whole history we do not wish to alter the smallest lineament.

To do justice to Mr. Harvey, and to mention (for it is high time) the principal subject of these Notes, it must be acknowledged that he has been extremely successful in his "*translated*" Bottom. Never was the asinine nature so intimately combined (though the union is extremely common) with the human, as we see it in the Border to the *Dramatis Personæ* of A Midsummer Night's Dream, and at the head of the third Act. The very ears of the patient animal, now grown into a coxcomb, declare Bottom's determination: "I will walk up and down here, and I will sing, that they shall hear I am not afraid."

---

[*] It is not easy to form a correct idea of the mortification which Cervantes must have suffered when he perceived the incapacity of the greatest part of his public to enter into the spirit of his admirable Romance. It is said that he published an ingenious attack upon his own Don Quixote, in order to draw the attention of the Spaniards to the aim he had in view, namely, an exposure of the absurdities of the books of chivalry, then the only reading of the Spaniards. There is not a trace of this book, though its existence and title El Buscapié (The Squib) are mentioned by cotemporaries. It is a fact, though it scarcely can be believed, that Le Sage, the author of Gil Blas, places Don Quixote in his Bachelier de Salamanque, in a list of Books of Chivalry. It is impossible he could have read it, for he was not a man to mistake Cervantes's humour.

The Fairies are a more difficult subject for the pencil, and quite unmanageable on the theatre. The contrast between their lightness and the massiveness of the other figures, hardly can be expressed in colours; and unless there existed a considerable number of juvenile prodigies intended for the stage, not the slightest approach to the ideal of the play could be made in the representation.

How is it then that Shakspere ventured upon such a subject?—I answer, that in regard to the composition, he felt the confidence of a high Genius; and was not deceived: no other but Shakspere could think of bringing a *wild dream* into poetical unity. He attempted it, and succeeded most wonderfully. In regard to the representation of such a Drama, we must remember that the age of our poet was that of *Masque*. The public was trained to that kind of theatrical exhibition, and found no difficulty in granting to the poet the most extravagant previous suppositions, provided he repaid them in beautiful verse. It cost the spectators of those days little or no difficulty to see the Actors, not on the stage, but in their own imagination. Though they beheld men and women of the usual size, they knew how to reduce them to the tiny beings conceived by the poet. The truth is that they were under a charm—the charm of Shakspere's descriptive and lyric poetry. Whoever becomes open to that mighty power, will see whatever the Magician wishes him to behold.

I cannot help lamenting that, in England, not a few make it a merit to stop their ears against the charmer. Tieck, the celebrated annotator of Schlegel's German Shakspere, which he concluded and published, in the judgment he gives of the Midsummer Night's Dream, charges not a few English critics with *shortsightedness*, for their efforts to place this composition among the earliest of the Poet, with the purpose of making his youth and inexperience a sufficient excuse for the want of unity which they find in this poetical revel. The German poet feels however convinced that the *Midsummer Night's Dream* was produced in the same period of "poetical intoxication to which we owe the *Merchant of Venice*, *Twelfth Night*, *As you like it*, and *Henry V*." In Tieck's opinion, "if Shakspere had written nothing but this *Dream,* he would have done enough to assert to himself a place among the greatest poets." He describes it as "a romantic Masterwork, in which a most flowery imagination, a most goodnatured and kind hearted drollery, an exquisite humour, attended by all the Caprice of Love, by all that is playful and joyful, appear in fantastic shapes to the incessant amusement and delight of the intelligent reader." To this animated description he adds an observation of which I strongly feel the truth when about to enter upon a slight analysis of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*: "Those, to whom it is denied to discover the ground of the poet's conception, to feel the originality of this composition, to give themselves up to the charm of its language and the lovely variety arising from the manifold changes of its figures—such readers would apply in vain for assistance to commentators and critics."

There is nevertheless a class for whom a judicious criticism may clear the way to a full enjoyment of this poetical jewel: I mean those who miss the perception of its high beauties from a preconceived notion, that the Poet himself did not know what he was about to write; that the fertility of his imagination, which found an ever ready help in the flexibility and richness of his language, tempted him to pour out at random, a multitude of pictures and sentiments, drawn indiscriminately from the highest regions of poetry and the lowest of wit and satire, all which he bound together without any other plan than the distribution suggested by the five Acts of a Drama. To any one placed, as the Germans say, on such a wrong standing point, the poem we examine must present the appearance of a wilderness, however beautifully decked with flowers; and though they may be capable of poetical enjoyment, they will rather turn to it, in Dodd's Beauties of Shakspere, than in its original form.

To remove a prejudice of this kind, provided it be not combined with a dull and unpoetical character, it will be enough to show what it was that Shakspere proposed to himself. This may be easily done if we consider the principles and feelings which in our poet's time, prevailed in regard to the *Masque.* This species of exhibition was a modification of the allegorical Dramas, acted almost universally during the period which intervened between the revival of the theatre in the dawn of the present literature and taste of Europe, and the regular performance of plays where the actors did not represent abstract Beings. *Masques* were properly shows addressed chiefly to the eyes, and indicative of that popular joy and merriment which used to burst out as uncontrouled as it was sincere. That feeling of popular joy, that madness of merriment has long disappeared from England, and been supplanted by a riotous spirit, coarse, vulgar, and prone to mischief. The better classes, being in a perpetual apprehension of vulgar mirth, do not know what it is to be cheerful, much less joyful, in public. In less *refined* countries such a thing as popular joy—a feeling which in a great degree equalizes all classes—" that spirit of gladsome revelry" (to use the expressive language of Mr. Knight's Illustrations, p. 354) " which it was for (Shakspere) to work out in this matchless drama," is still alive; those who have witnessed the good humour, the desire to please and be pleased which it produces in the public, may readily form an idea of the state of mind upon which the writer of a *Masque* (even when as in the present case the *Masque* had become a regular play) might reckon. The spirit of poetry possessed and pervaded the most mixed audiences. A few popularly known names, a slight foundation of some faintly traditional mythology or superstition, was all that a poet wanted to work upon. Thanks to the good temper of the public revellers, and their habit of giving themselves up to the fancy of those who undertook to amuse them, Music, a gay show, and a dance joined together, though slenderly, by verse, were sure of universal favour.

But here we may clearly see the immense distance between the Genius of Shakspere and of all others who trod a similar path. Tieck, to whose observations a reference has already been made, mentions that in 1598, two years before *A Midsummer Night's Dream* appeared in print, Shakspere's friend and patron the Earl of Southampton had married his long courted Mistress Varnon, and thinks it probable (I do not know whether the conjecture is his own or borrowed) that the Fairy part of the play may have been a Masque written upon that occasion. Nobody can deny that the fable would be extremely appropriate. This might be the nucleus of the more complete work we possess, which may have been exhibited as a popular treat on St. John's Eve, that universally kept festival, on which, even at this day the memory of many an ancient superstition, such as *plucking the vervaine*, is revived in various parts of the world, and especially in Spain.

Here then we have a tolerable sketch of the circumstances which contributed to *intoxicate* Shakspere for the composition of this most poetical of all poetical effusions. I do not know whether it has been noticed that his inimitable description of the true Poet is found in the fifth Act of this Play. To me it seems that it was directly suggested by the work which he had nearly accomplished. Let us quote it, since it can never be too much repeated.

> "The poet's eye in a fine phrenzy rolling,
> Doth glance from heaven to earth, from earth to heaven,
> And as imagination bodies forth
> The forms of things unknown, the poet's pen
> Turns them to shapes, and gives to airy nothing
> A local habitation and a name."

Have we not here the truest description of the Midsummer Night's Dream? Is it not the purest creation of the poet's fancy? Let us figure to ourselves the distress of a common votary of the Muses, if having to work out such a dramatic poem as would answer the expectation of a Midsummer-night's audience, at the period when England most deserved the epithet of *Merry*, he had found himself in possession only of an unsettled Mythology of Elves and Fairies, with their sovereigns Oberon and Titania;[*] and some fragment about Theseus and Hippolyta, which he might combine as well as he could with the world of *Faerie*. Add to this the necessity of having an Anti-Masque,[†] or Clownish Interlude, which the public expected in those days. The attempt to reduce these heterogeneous materials to unity, would appear perfectly absurd. How wonderful, then, must have been the power of that mind which, verifying its own grand conception of the Poet, seized both the external world and the world of Fancy, and with an ease, which has not left the slightest mark of labour, made the sauciness of Satire, the playfulness of Fancy, and the intenseness of Sentiment, unite in the most perfect harmony! In the *Midsummer Night's Dream*, the mind of Shakspere does not only surpass in swiftness the nimble spirit that will "put a girdle round about the earth in forty minutes," but with a kind of omnipresence, chooses, without dizziness or confusion, every object of highest beauty and cheerful interest in the vast fields of reality, of imagination, of sentiment.

---

[*] The *Faerie Queen* was published some years before the Midsummer Night's Dream, but its world of Faerie is very different from that of Shakspere; see Keightley's Fairy Mythology, vol. i. at the beginning. I add a short quotation from that able and entertaining writer. "The various species (of Fairies) so run into and are confounded with one another, the actions and attributes of one kind are so frequently ascribed to another, that scarcely have we begun to erect our system (of classification) when we find the foundation crumbling under our feet."—Vol. i. p. 20.

[†] The writer of these notes is old enough to have seen a public Masque in Spain, when CARLOS III. ascended the throne. He well remembers the delight which, as a boy, he derived from the PREGON, (Proclamation) as a coarse parody of the Mask itself. This love of Parody is found in all ages and periods. The *Satyri protervi* of Horace (Ars Poet. v. 225—233,) appear to have been a regular Parody of the Tragedy to which they served as interludes.

Any one who might wish to give specimens of these varieties of poetry, would have to copy the whole play. I will content myself with pointing to the diligent student of Shakspere, a method of analysing the wonderful composition before us. Let the attentive reader search in the first place for the *descriptive poetry* of the play—the poetry of sense and vision; and he will find splendid passages of this kind almost in every page. He must also observe a dazzling undercurrent of images which gives life and motion to the style in which the larger pictures or conceptions are drawn. As an illustration of my meaning, I will take that other well known passage which enumerates the "crosses of true lovers." The Poet had to say, that undisturbed happiness in love is transient. Observe the crowd of images which constitute the expression :—

" . . . . Or, if there were a sympathy in choice
War, death, or sickness did lay siege to it;
Making it momentary as a sound,
Swift as a shadow, short as any dream,
Brief as the lightning in the collied* night,
That in a spleen unfolds both heaven and earth,
And ere a man hath power to say,—Behold!
The jaws of darkness do devour it up:
So quick bright things come to confusion."

This may be called the *colouring* in poetry: but where, out of Shakspere's compositions, shall we find any equally splendid?

In regard to descriptions, the great difficulty is to select. The most lovely scenes of visible nature seem spontaneously to have arranged themselves so as to clothe an originally poor subject, merely for the sake of the Artist. If some one has to praise the charm of a woman's speech, Spring lends the poet all its sweetest beauties.

" Your eyes are load-stars, and your tongue's sweet air,
More tunable than lark to shepherd's ear,
When wheat is green, when hawthorn buds appear."

Is an appointment to be made, the lovely moon in the act of beholding the reflection of her own beauty, and spreading pearly dew over the fields, must be the time-piece by which to fix the moment of meeting.

---

* "*Collied*, black, smutted. This is a word still in use in the Staffordshire collieries. Shakspere found it there, and transplanted it into the region of poetry."

> "To-morrow night, when Phœbe doth behold
> Her silver visage in the wat'ry glass,
> Decking with liquid pearl the bladed grass,
> (A time that lovers' flights doth still conceal)
> Through Athens' gates have we devis'd to steal."

Let no one imagine himself a poet, till he can borrow his phraseology from a similar dictionary. There is hardly a line in this play that may not be used as a remarkable model of poetical language.

But we must proceed to the still higher triumphs of the Poet's art in the region of pure fiction. It is Shakspere that has given the *Fairies* a local habitation and a name. He has associated these minute, but powerful beings, with the world of man. The interference of these mythological powers is far from being a mere appendage to the principal action of the play. It is their interest in the affairs of distinguished mortals that makes them such important actors in the Midsummer Night's Dream. Titania loves Theseus, Oberon admires Hippolita, and both wish to make their union prosperous. Thus in the hands of Shakspere both the real and the poetical universe become linked by feeling. His "human mortals" are true to their nature: his superhuman Agents have a moral cast, which claims kindred with ours. Nothing can be more beautifully consistent than the individual characters of the Fairies. With the exquisite art of Painters, who never introduce a striking colouring into one part of their pictures, without having prepared the eye by some touch of it in another part, Shakspere has given us his "lob of spirits," his clownish Fairy, his admirable Puck, Oberon's Jester, to bring his human clowns *into keeping*. Let those who wish to enjoy Shakspere's most poetical play, study the chidings of Oberon and Titania, and endeavour to perceive the exquisite blending of the human with the superhuman in their manner of feeling. Let them observe how naturally and delicately the passing events of the real world are made to give reality and relief to his aerial Beings. Their quarrels disturb the earth, whilst their concord should bless it.

> "Therefore, the winds, piping to us in vain,
> As in revenge, have sucked up from the sea
> Contagious fogs; which, falling in the land,
> Have every pelting* river made so proud,
> That they have overborne their continents.†
> The ox hath therefore stretch'd his yoke in vain,

---

* "*Pelting*,—petty, contemptible."

† "*Continents*,—banks. A *continent* is that which contains."

> The ploughman lost his sweat; and the green corn
> Hath rotted, ere his youth attain'd a beard*:
> The fold stands empty in the drowned field,
> And crows are fatted with the murrain flock. . . ."

This admirable description of the untoward seasons of the year 1599 was probably added by Shakspere after the first representation. I regret that the quotation is too long for inserting it without curtailment; especially as I must give a specimen of what may be called the Fairies' Poetry—the poetry of the most poetical creations. Prose was, of course, inconsistent with these etherial spirits, and consequently their whole dialogue is lyrical. But Shakspere knows no boundary to the regions of poetry, and can raise it to almost any pitch. See, for instance, the picture of the Indian queen, the friend of Titania, beginning,—

> "Set your heart at rest,
> The fairy land buys not the child of me,
> His mother was a vot'ress of my order."—Act II. Sc. 2.

See also, in the same scene, Oberon's account of the flight of Cupid, and his lost shaft; and lastly, (not because it ends the series, but because it must not be here *endless*, as it seems in the play,) see Oberon's description of Titania's flowery couch, in the same act and scene, beginning, "I know a bank where the wild thyme blows."

But must we now descend to the lower region of satire? We may feel some reluctance to do so, when analyzing and almost reducing this incomparable composition to a skeleton. We have left ourselves without a means of transition. Shakspere, the great master of poetical harmony, could not be guilty of such an unprepared discord. His clowns show themselves early, and assume their proper places without the least intrusion. Wit was always welcome to the taste of our poet, no less than to that of his public. Conceit, of which he must have found abundance among his companions the actors, and his envious rivals the playwrights, appears to have been an object of particular dislike to him, as indeed it must be to every superior mind. He has therefore attacked with his keen and irresistible wit, a great number of its modifications. There is a great similarity between the spirit of *Midsummer Night's Dream*, and that of *Love's Labour Lost*, especially in the satirical parts of each. But the pedantry attacked in the former play is more artificial, and we might say scholastic; in the latter the poet has exposed to view that more amusing inborn vanity which may exist together with the grossest ignorance. Bottom is, in his own view, a heaven-born, universal Genius, such as in the shape of many an actor must have plagued Shakspere during the whole of his histrionic career. The truth of the picture is such, that Bottom, the weaver, stands before us as *universal*, an abstract applicable to hundreds of concrete Bottoms, of all classes and professions.

---

* Can any one blame this personification in the language of a Being who can see Nature as one animated Whole?

Whoever has made an intimate acquaintance with Bottom the Athenian, will find him repeated, though in various external disguises, at almost every social party; he will discover him under the wig of the Lawyer, and the bands of the Divine. Why not? Bottom is still ready to do every thing, to play every part, though "his chief humour was for a tyrant." Does Bottom get admittance into Church, Chapel, or Court of Justice, then "let the audience look to their eyes; he will move storms." He knows what "is lofty," and can most accurately distinguish it, "Ercles' vein," a tyrant's vein, from every other; "a lover is more condoling." Nay, if any one of the family of the Bottoms be allowed to "hide his face,"—his coarse vulgar face, the true stamp of his nature,—"he may play Thisby too; he will speak in a monstrous little voice:—'Thisne, Thisne—Ah, Pyramus, my lover dear; thy Thisby dear! and lady dear!'" Let us be candid; have we not witnessed such changes in a long discourse, which beginning in a most thundering vein, "Ercles' vein," has gradually grown "more condoling," till at last it settled in "monstrous little voice" which melted all the "Thisnes" within hearing? I am sure I could as I sit here lay my hand on such a Discourse, and, if I mistake not, it is on original sin, and the thousands of little infants it kills in the course of a calendar year.—But then, that peculiar genius for roaring! that roaring "that will do any man's heart good to hear!" that roaring to be *encored!* "Let him roar again, let him roar again!" Is not all this a daily occurrence? How could it be otherwise, when the effects are so wonderful and the performance so easy? "You may do it *extempore*, for it is nothing but roaring." Incredulous reader! if you will not take my word, walk quietly on a Sunday about the streets of any considerable town in England, or rather in Ireland, still the land of black roaring Lions, in spite of the large importations we make of them; and if you do not hear the terrific voice of the *extempore* performer in the middle of the road, I give you leave to say that the Fairies have been playing tricks with my recollections.

But how is it that I find myself upon so opposite a key to that in which I began? I answer, how could I prevent it, having given myself up, heart and soul, to the enjoyment of the Midsummer Night's Dream? Is there not a charm in that Play which makes the unresisting reader follow the poet's eye "from Heaven to earth, from earth to Heaven?" If he is thoroughly open to the ethereal influences of a Titania, will he not also be exposed to be

"Led about a round,
Through bog, through bush, through brake, through briar,"

by Puck, the merry wanderer of the night? Save me from the one-sided, or one-eyed critic, who in the midst of Shakspere's revelry never feels the power of "that shrewd and knavish sprite."

J. B. W.

ART. III.—ON FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY. BY DR. K. G. BRETSCHNEIDER.*

THE word Freedom exercises a magical power over our minds. The noblest amongst mankind have, in all ages, striven after freedom; whilst even those who, in theory, deny its rights, will not, in practice, submit to have any portion of their liberty wrested from them. The greater part of the dissentions, political as well as religious, which distract and agitate the public mind at the present time, have their origin in the obscurity and vagueness of the generally prevailing notions respecting freedom.

It is intended in the present article to set forth that view of moral, political, and religious freedom which, after the matured consideration of years, commends itself as true to the writer's own mind. A brief sketch is all that can be here attempted, and much must be left to be supplied by the reflection of the reader; the leading features of the whole subject may, however, be given within the limits of a few pages.

I. We begin with Moral Freedom, since, of the several kinds of freedom, it is that which the most nearly concerns each individual; it is that which all men desire, and that which all ought to possess. Moreover, it is in accordance with the notions entertained of moral freedom, that people in general square their opinions of civil and religious liberty.

Experience teaches us that, while every one believes in the freedom of the will, and in action lays claim to such freedom, yet it is the almost invariable conclusion of the profoundest speculations,—of researches carried out into the regions of freedom and necessity—that moral freedom is not demonstrable; that all human action is under subjection to the absolute will of God. Those who treat the subject the most fairly, say that moral freedom is to be believed as a problem attested by our consciousness, but which does not bear to be submitted to the critical investigations of the reason, conflicting as it does, inexplicably, with the divine sovereignty.

It would, indeed, be sad if, whilst we, *practically*, maintained the doctrine of moral freedom, we found ourselves compelled, *theoretically*, to deny it. Unquestionably there are truths *immediately* certain, which neither admit nor require proof by means of other (higher) truths; because they have their existence in the mind, not as derived, but as primitive and direct truths; such are all ideas, and such is the idea of morality. Still these undemonstrable and absolutely certain truths cannot contradict the convictions of reason and experience; since it is clearly impossible that two contradictory propositions can be alike true. In such case, therefore, we must presuppose an error on one side or on the other: which error it must be our aim to detect. The two positions, "*Man is free to choose either good or evil,*" and "*Each human action is necessary, by virtue of the absolute will of God,*" cannot both be true; and it is an altogether inadmissible postulate that the latter is to be received as a theoretical truth, whilst the former is to be practically believed as a mystery. Much rather must we seek to reconcile a contradiction, which can originate only in a delusion on the one side or the other.

---

* From the "Allgemeine Kirchen Zeitung," of July 1839.

The ground of this contradiction is a misconception of the nature of moral freedom. Moral freedom has been commonly represented as consisting in *the absence of all internal and external obligation to act*:—as being the power to choose between good and evil, by the mere exercise of the will, unimpelled by any necessary determining cause. A freedom of this sort no where exists: it is, in fact, a nonentity. That will which is free, which is unsubjected to all external constraint, is the will of God, and of God only. All created existence, and consequently man, is limited by the external. This subjection to the external is too evident to escape recognition; and, therefore, it was felt to be upon the internal necessity to act that the question turned; and much was conceived to be gained when it was affirmed, that freedom consists, not in a freedom of acting, but in a freedom of willing:—that *volition* is altogether free; that it is and must be free from all external determining causes:—that it can and does spring out of mere willing, that is, out of the unimpelled proper exertion of the power of willing: so that it depends, exclusively, upon this arbitrary power of the will, whether, for example, a man chooses or does not choose to commit a theft, or to utter a calumny.

But, in truth, there is no such thing as this unimpelled will. It cannot exist even in God; for the divine freedom is a reasonable internal necessity, which absolutely excludes the possibility of choice between opposed objects. We are thus naturally led to the conclusion, that moral freedom in man cannot be anything different from this. And it would, at once, have been perceived that such must be the fact, had not the existence of an independent arbitrary will in man been regarded as indispensable, in order to remove the origination of sin from God, and to impute it to this arbitrary will in the human race.

The matter is simply this. That which is named volition is a movement within us, which discovers itself in a desire, or an action. Such movement within us cannot take place unless some previous impression be made upon our consciousness. It is the entering of this impression into the mind which produces the movement within us. A thing of which we have no consciousness is to us, to our desire or aversion, as if it were not, as if it had not been. So long as America was undiscovered, for the European it had no existence; and if a misfortune occur, so long as we are ignorant of the fact, so long as the knowledge of it does not reach our consciousness, it is to us the same thing as if it had not happened. A wound received in battle, but which is not felt during the heat of conflict, produces no movement of the will, so long as it remains unperceived. Each movement of the will proceeds from a modification of our consciousness. The more decidedly the consciousness becomes modified, the more decided is the movement thence arising. All the movements of the will have their adequate cause in the impressions which are made upon the mind; and no such thing exists as a will out of mere willing. If the impression made upon the consciousness does not include a determining impulse to act, no action results; at most only a wish. If two impressions of equal strength are received into the mind, the will comes to no decision, but remains perfectly passive, till the one impression or the other gains a preponderance; or till some secondary cause is superadded, and determines the choice.

The impressions of which we are conscious, are impressions made upon our senses, or upon our reason, or upon both; and, since it is these impressions which determine us to desire or to aversion, *they are the causes of volition.* To this end, these impressions must have a suitable degree of force. This force depends, sometimes, upon the inherent power of the impressions themselves;—sometimes upon the clearness and definiteness with which they impress themselves upon the mind; sometimes, indeed principally, upon the permanence of their influence upon the mind. The durability of the impressions is of chief importance, since it is by a lasting influence, alone, that constant and consistent action is established. Impressions, originally weak, gain a gradually increasing strength, by being retained in the thoughts. Permanent, abiding impressions, form the dispositions; and when these are rules of conduct, they are termed principles of action.

The question now arises, Have we power, in ourselves, over the impressions which enter our consciousness; and to what extent have we such power? The answer to this question includes the answer to the inquiry, Have we control over our actions? Now, what is termed moral freedom is nothing more nor less than the power we possess over the impressions which enter our minds, and thereby over those movements of the will, which, by virtue of these impressions, are produced within us. An animal has no control over the impressions made upon its consciousness, and consequently none over its conduct: it is dependent, not free; it is determined in its movements by the dynamical action of the impressions entering its consciousness on each other. It may, perhaps, be urged, in opposition to this, that in some particular cases, an impression is resisted; that, for example, a dog does not seize upon meat placed within its reach. This however can only happen, in consequence of our having by means of frequent repetition, forced a much stronger impression upon the dog's remembrance; in order that the one impression might always accompany the other, and that the stronger might destroy the power of the weaker. Whenever the dog transgressed, chastisement was employed, till, at length, the impression of the dainty morsel became associated with that of the beating, and the stronger impression of the punishment, kept the weaker, of the food, in check.

But man has a power, in himself, over his impressions; it is however, a limited power. We cannot directly hinder an impression from without from entering our consciousness: and sometimes the impression is so powerful, that we are quite unable, for a while,—till it has become weakened by time,—to put it away from us. The most exemplary are, therefore, liable to be surprised by an impression, which may incline them to evil. But we have the power, not only to divert our thoughts from such an impression, and thus to expel it from our minds, but we are also able, by means of dwelling upon other impressions, which we can at the dictate of our reason recall, so completely to enfeeble and extinguish it, as wholly to destroy its influence. We can, at will, recall and dwell upon certain impressions, which recollection and reflection may suggest; and, by retaining them continually in our thoughts, cause them to acquire so predominant an ascendancy over us, that they shall outweigh other impressions. Thus we may oppose the impressions of God,—of the divine laws,—of the beauty and dignity of moral perfection,—to the impressions of sensual gratification. In this way do we exercise a power, according to our judgment, over those movements within us, which the impressions we receive might produce. We determine our conduct according to individual insight, and this is moral freedom.

Yet, this insight is nothing capricious and arbitrary, but something fixed and definite: namely, the ideas of absolute Truth and Goodness. The intelligent human being perceives that these ideas, which constitute the essence of his reason, must form the highest rule of his conduct, and that therefore he should, by keeping them continually in his thoughts, cause them to have the ascendancy in his mind, and implicitly follow their impulse. Thus to order his conduct is indeed his imperative duty; and those ideas, which form themselves into a legislative power within him, are the laws of his actions. He is conscious that it is incumbent on him to regulate all his desires and actions in obedience to these highest laws; and it is exactly in the exercise of this power which he possesses, at any rate to a certain extent, that he feels himself free. He has the power, namely, of causing the impression of absolute goodness to dwell in his thoughts; of combining and associating other impressions with this; of constituting it a permanent and presiding principle within him; and of thus rendering subordinate to it all opposing impressions which enter his mind. This is his moral freedom, which is no other than the power to will, and to determine his conduct in accordance with the dictates of his reason: that is, in harmony with his idea of absolute goodness.

Moral freedom, therefore, is not the exercise of an arbitrary choice between good and evil, neither is it exemption from submission to all law, or from subjection to determining motives;—but it is obedience yielded to a law, not from regard to outward authority, but from an appreciation of the goodness of that law. The doctrine of freedom, and the doctrine of necessity, differ in this—the one implies subjection to a law from reasonable conviction, the other obedience to an external and irresistible authority. Freedom is not even conceivable in the absence of a law to which submission is rendered from reasonable conviction. It is, consequently, an error to contend, as men frequently do, that moral freedom is the power to choose between good and evil. A power to choose between a thing and its negation is a nothing. According to this notion the practice of virtue would include the surrender of freedom; whereas, in point of fact, virtue is freedom. This notion, moreover, attributes to evil, to sin, an independent existence, making it the necessary and ever continuing companion of virtue; instead of which evil is constantly passing away: it is the path through which we tread our way to freedom. Again, it is no less a mistake to regard freedom as the power of willing, in the absence of all determining motives. Man's freedom consists in the power he possesses of permitting his will to be influenced by such motives only as his reason approves. And thus vanishes the painful contradiction alleged to exist between man's freedom and the omnipotent will of God. The absolutely-perfect will of God is, in truth, the perfect law of liberty: and, entire subjection of our will to the divine will *from a recognition of its absolute perfection*, this is freedom. The more free we become, the more is our will in unison with the divine will.

What has now been said of moral freedom is applicable to freedom *in the idea*:—as it should exist in man, rather than to freedom as it actually exhibits itself in its present imperfect development. For, it is not the starting point, but the ultimate aim, the very summit of human culture. Moral training begins with obedience to authority, without the reasonable assent of the agent. The child receives the first rules of behaviour from his parents, as commands of power and authority; moral laws being enjoined upon the authority of God. It is not till his reasoning faculties are awakened, that the grounds of obedience are laid before him; and it is only gradually that his understanding becomes so far matured, as that obedience is rendered by him, no longer on account of authority, but from inward rational conviction. By many, this point of moral education is never reached; it is the few only, among mankind, who advance so far as to recognize the goodness of the law. To all, therefore, who have neither the power, nor the opportunity of raising themselves to the lofty eminence of moral insight, authority must continue to stand in its stead. It is, in part, Christianity, in its character of a divine institution; in part, the decisions of men of acknowledged rectitude and mental superiority; and, in part, prevailing customs and civil regulations which constitute this authority in relation to morals. Obedience to authority, strictly speaking, is not freedom; but it is allied to it—is the nearest approach to it; and to such as are unable to attain to individual insight, authority forms the necessary and legitimate substitute. Hence it follows that authority—if it shall not be productive of slavery and immorality, —must positively assert itself only as a *substitute for individual insight*, in the case of such as are incompetent; not indeed as an authority claiming absolute power, and admitting not of question or dispute, but as an authority of wisdom—of superior intelligence;—as an authority which not merely sanctions, but requires that every individual, who is capable, shall himself investigate and pursue that same path of inquiry, by which truth has been found by others. An authority of mere might and despotism excludes all individual freedom, all private insight and examination, and insists on an unquestioning obedience to its commands. But the authority of knowledge, or intelligence, is the authority of those who have become morally free; of those who reverence the laws of morality, because their reason is convinced of their truth. And confidence and belief, in this authority, is not demanded in the names of the persons, but in the names of truth and wisdom. The very characteristic of such authority, and which distinguishes it absolutely from the authority of mere supremacy—is freedom: it leaves those whose confidence it asks, free to search into and prove the grounds upon which confidence is demanded; and to follow the same intellectual course, by which others have attained the result; carefully supplying every possible aid, in furtherance of the attainment of that individual insight, which shall supersede authority altogether. That authority which is based upon knowledge, and appeals to reason for its sanction, is consonant with freedom. It is the unavoidable, necessary, and beneficial substitute for intellectual attainment, during the first stages of moral culture; and it relinquishes its empire, in exact proportion to the degree of moral progress in the individual. Thus parents and teachers employ authority, in the moral training of children, with the express aim of gradually rendering all authority superfluous, and of making the pupil morally independent. And the more free he actually becomes, that is, the more clearly he perceives the inherent goodness of the law enjoined on him, and the more uniformly he regulates his conduct in conformity with it, the less and less needful does the exercise of authority become, till at length it is entirely withdrawn.

II. What has been said of moral freedom is now to be applied to Political Freedom; upon which subject, likewise, many erroneous notions prevail. It is a great mistake to suppose that political freedom consists in unlimited license; in the absence of all controul; in each person being free to do what he pleases. Such complete exemption from all restraint is impossible, even in the case of the solitary occupant of a desert island; how then could it obtain in a civil community, to the very existence of which the relations of social life, and the law of reciprocation are necessary conditions? None but a madman could understand political freedom in such a sense. Neither, however, does it consist in the right of each individual to submit to such restrictions only as he may think fit. For the individual of a community cannot, according to his pleasure, determine those personal relations which connect him with the state. Nor does freedom consist in this,—that the power and rule are shared by all, instead of being vested in one. Political freedom no more ceases to exist, because the state is a monarchy, and the laws emanate from one supreme potentate, than moral freedom ceases to exist, because, in the moral world, there is one monarch, from whom all laws proceed, even God. It is an abuse of words, to call the oligarchical or the democratical the only free forms of government; and to place them, as such, in opposition to the monarchical. The political freedom of a state depends, not so much upon whether it be ruled by one, or by many; by elected magistrates, or hereditary princes; but it depends essentially upon this,—that the supreme, and above all the legislative, power is not controuled by arbitrary caprice. A government may be purely democratic in its form, and yet, if the rulers dare to enact arbitrary laws, that government is a despotism.

Political freedom bears an analogy to moral freedom, and consists in this,—that the laws and institutions are framed in harmony with the eternal idea of just and right, and of rational social communion; or, that they are so constituted, that their justice and efficiency cannot fail to be felt and acknowledged by each subject capable of judging of them; so that each subject shall, from his own reasonable conviction, render a voluntary obedience to the laws. It is nothing to the purpose here, whether the state be an elective, or an hereditary monarchy; an aristocracy, or a democracy; the idea of right—of absolute justice—may reign under each of these several forms. In fact, it matters not in the question now before us, whether the laws be made by the king and his councillors only, or by the assembled representatives of the nation. The indispensable condition of political freedom is, that the laws enacted be consonant with the idea of justice, and therefore entitled to claim the free assent of the subject. Political freedom exists wherever the subject has to yield obedience, not to an arbitrary caprice, but to established laws:—to laws and institutions which correspond with the idea of equity, and which may, therefore, reasonably demand the universal acquiescence of the intelligent members of the community. Every people governed by such laws, and yielding to them a voluntary submission, is a free people.

Thus, as those only are morally free, and feel themselves to be so, who are sensible of the excellence of the laws of morality, and who therefore subject themselves, in all cases, voluntarily and joyfully to their guidance, so those only are politically free, and feel themselves to be so, who recognize the excellence of the political laws, framed in accordance with the idea of right, —(of the philosophical idea adapted to the modes of life, and the relations of a community)—and who render them a willing submission, not feeling such submission a constraint, but a security. The more the people can be led to perceive the goodness and necessity of the civil laws and institutions, the more spontaneously will they obey them;—the more free will they feel themselves;—and the more free will they actually be. But little hitherto has, in point of fact, been done in existing monarchies towards such end; and therefore it is, that the people are so easily misled by the delusion that freedom is to be found only in this or that form. It is highly desirable that, in all states (in all states that can boast of equitable laws), each subject should be instructed in the laws and constitution of the government under which he lives; and also, that every new law and regulation should, previous to its enactment, be submitted to public discussion. Such a course would not only ensure the more general perception of the goodness of the law, but it would, at the same time, and which is of great importance, be the means of engendering the feeling in the breasts of the people, that the law being just and necessary, is therefore deserving of universal approbation and obedience. The peace and contentment of a people depend much less upon the actually existing degree of freedom, than upon the subjects believing and feeling themselves to be free. The people are not morally free because they have a knowledge of the laws of morality, but because they appreciate their excellence, and therefore feel themselves bound to comply with them. As long as the people consider the laws of morality in the light of arbitrary commands, they will disregard them, and go astray; and as long as the people believe the civil laws, (be they ever so good,) to be the dictates of caprice, so long will they be inclined to insubordination and revolt.

But political freedom must, of necessity, remain less perfect than moral freedom; first, because the political law cannot be brought to that state of completeness which belongs to the moral law. The latter is the *ideal* of moral excellence, which resides in every human breast; but the former is not the eternal idea of just and right in itself, but the idea in its adaptation to given, imperfect, and variable relations:—to the concrete form of a people as existing at a particular time; and it is consequently dependent on a variety of conditions. The moral law is universal for all men; but the political law is, in its adaptation, special for one particular people. Secondly, political freedom must remain less perfect than moral freedom, because individual assent from reasonable insight can never be so general in the case of the political law, as in that of the moral law. A recognition of the excellence of the political law presupposes an amount of positive knowledge, respecting the nature of a community, its relations and requirements, which cannot be equally attainable by all: and with a large proportion, probably with the greater number of the people, external authority must continue to supply deficiency of insight into the goodness of the law. Whilst therefore, in relation to morality, the *continual* exercise of external authority, as the substitute for inward conviction, ought gradually to become unnecessary, the *constant* exertion of a civil authority, on the contrary, is absolutely indispensable. And consequently, such authority exists in every legislature where its nature is, in any degree, understood. Authority must be set up, and must at the same time be declared sacred and inviolable if it shall retain its power. This is the ground of the indisputable authority of the monarch; this the reason why, in republics, where this venerated authority is absent, revolutions and insubordination so often break out; this the cause wherefore it is fruitless in democracies to set up the authority of the people as the highest authority, it being irrational that those who need to have authority exercised over them, should themselves constitute that authority. A revolutionary spirit is not to be extinguished by making experiments with constitutions, as the experience of France teaches; neither is it to be subdued by maintaining the conservative principle:—by inflexible adherence to that which is ancient and established, but by far different means. Let the civil laws and political institutions be reformed, and be made accordant with the idea of right; but, above all, let the understandings of the people be enlightened by the diffusion of all kinds of knowledge; let their minds be educated, in order that they may gradually become more and more able to comprehend the excellence and necessity of the laws of their country—then will they feel themselves free; and then will they yield a voluntary obedience.

III. We now pass on to the consideration of RELIGIOUS FREEDOM. Freedom of belief, also, does not consist in absolute license; it is not the exemption from all obligation and restraint; it is not the ability to believe what one will, nor the right to form an opinion according to one's pleasure. Belief, being a thing depending on the judgment, is in no sense an act of the will; and still less is it an arbitrary act of the will; but it is a result of arguments—over which the will has no power—operating upon our understanding. A man, therefore, may be held responsible for what he does, but not for what he believes. To make him responsible for his belief is an unreasonable tyranny. A man cannot compel himself to believe that which he may wish to be true; and how then can he be compelled to believe on the command of another? Belief, which is the action of the mind in holding as true something of which it has become conscious, is not free, but altogether conditional. Wherefore, the notion of freedom of belief is only negative: it is the inadmissibility of all compulsion in matters of conviction. No human being has the right to command another to believe that which he does not inwardly assent to from conviction—from conviction grounded upon arguments.

As moral freedom consists in obedience to the moral law being rendered from individual internal conviction; and political freedom in subjection to the civil law being yielded from an inward sense of its excellence and necessity; so religious freedom consists in this,—that the faith is not something prescribed, but a belief founded on arguments recognizable by all who are competent to judge of them, and therefore claiming the assent of others upon the inward conviction of their own minds. Religious freedom is the characteristic of every church thus organized; and it exists wherever a belief is set forth, not as a command, but as a subject for investigation and proof. A revealed faith forms no exception, even though announced by divine authority. For, since with respect to all to whom the revelation was not immediately given, but who received it by transmission, this authority is an historical, derived authority, not only must it of necessity rest upon arguments, but these arguments must needs be investigated and approved: otherwise there would exist no means of discriminating between a true revelation and a false: or of deciding whether we ought to follow Moses, Zoroaster, Mahomet, Confucius, Dalai Lama, or Christ. Least of all can an examination of evidence, and individual mental conviction be dispensed with in the believers in Christianity; seeing that its divine authority rests upon historical facts which are precisely the legitimate objects of examination; and seeing that adherence to the Christian faith depends on the right understanding and use of the Bible, traditions, and church doctrines—the sources from whence our knowledge of the Christian religion is derived. Hence it becomes apparent, that it is as necessary to permit and to require an examination of that which is to be believed, as of the moral and civil laws. To prohibit an acquaintance with the principles of morality and of civil government is, in fact, to encourage vice and insubordination; and to forbid inquiry into the grounds of religious belief, is to induce scepticism. The wide spread infidelity, and the continual rebellion against church authority in the middle ages, were the natural consequences of the religious tyranny which distinguished that period.

Still, however, in the case of all those who either have not yet formed, or who are incapable of forming their own views, authority must, in religion, as well as in morals and politics, stand in the place of arguments, and be the substitute for individual insight and conviction. It is the belief of learned theologians, and of the church collectively—and not the inspired character, the divine origin of the faith inculcated—which constitutes this authority in matters of religion: for the doctrine of a revelation must itself rest upon the authority of divines and the attestation of the church. The authority here spoken of is not opposed to freedom; for it is not a despotic or arbitrary authority, interdicting all examination, but it is the authority of wisdom—of superior intelligence, which not only sanctions examination, but demands that the grounds upon which it is based shall be investigated, in order that the individual assent of the believers may be gained, and that the exercise of authority may be dispensed with. But theology, like all other sciences, must at first be received by the pupil upon authority. He must begin by believing on the word of his instructor, whatever he is taught either of language, history, geography, and all other branches of knowledge; but he is afterwards required to investigate, for himself, the truth of the lessons he has received; and if the student do this, he gradually acquires insight:—a real perception of these things; and his knowledge, which previously rested altogether upon the authority of his instructors, now becomes his own. But those who are desirous of profiting by a science they cannot study for themselves, must be content to rely on the authority of others. Such is the condition of the unlearned in astronomy, physics, mechanics, history, philosophy, jurisprudence. Theoretically considered, it is just to maintain that authority ought not to rule in any of the sciences; but, as it is impossible that all can attain the requisite amount of scientific acquirement, in order to supersede authority, we must always remain under the necessity of trusting to the learning of others, with regard to those things of which we are ignorant. The theologian and the jurist rely on the authority of the physician; and the physician and the jurist rely on that of the theologian. Yet in so doing, no sacrifice of intellectual freedom is involved; because, in all these cases, the authority is not a groundless authority, but a well-founded authority; is not an oracular authority, but an authority subjecting itself to the freest examination; is not an absolute authority, but a supplementary authority, supplying deficiency of knowledge; but, at the same time, consenting, nay, demanding, that every one shall investigate its decisions, and believe them on his own conviction.

Thus does it become evident, that all who are not themselves instructed in moral, political, and religious knowledge, are unquestionably bound to trust and submit to the authority of the learned.

But what is the duty of him who is master of these sciences, of him whose peculiar avocation it is to cultivate a knowledge of them? Should he become convinced that an assertion, which has hitherto been sanctioned, and consecrated by authority, is an unfounded assertion, is he justified in denying it; in stedfastly and openly avowing his denial; and in renouncing his obligation to pay regard to it, in his conduct? This question merits particular consideration.

We would say in reply—

First: That the positions of all and every science, and consequently those also of moral, political, and theological science, must ever be submitted to examination and proof; and must, *if true*, stand the test of rigid scrutiny. This constant investigation is necessary, partly because no science is so perfect as to render the existence of error, in any of its details, impossible; and it is by repeated examinations only, that errors are detected: partly because no science, not even theology, has originated from authority. Each science has, or at any rate ought to have, sprung out of a perception of its truth. The Christian Revelation is no exception; for its first position—that it is authentically recorded of Christ, that he lived, taught, and acted so and so—is not in itself certain, but rests on assertions and arguments which have been verified; which are still regarded as true, and which therefore remain subject to ever fresh and continual investigation. No scientific truth can be withdrawn from the field of free inquiry, if it be desired that it shall retain its character of truth, in the estimation of mankind.

Secondly: That it is the imperative duty of every one who is competent, to inquire into, and to convince himself of the truth of each position of science which he has received upon authority; and that if, after careful and patient examination, he shall discover an error or misapprehension in that which he has been taught he is fully justified in openly declaring it. Error, of every kind, whether moral, political, or theological, is diametrically opposed to the very nature of things, and it is consequently injurious; it must sooner or later be detected, and it ought, immediately on its discovery, to be discarded. And since the removal of error can be effected only by means of such frequent exposition of the grounds of its falsity as shall cause it to be no longer upheld and promulgated by authority, the open avowal of error should not only be permitted, but should be promoted and encouraged. If such exposition should be prohibited in favour of any particular doctrine, the protected doctrine would no longer be a position of science, requiring to be believed upon individual conviction; it would instantly become a position of arbitrary authority, requiring a blind assent and the sacrifice of individual freedom. Not to dwell on the fact that a doctrine which must needs be maintained by power and compulsion, has lost all claim to be received as true; and will not fail to be universally regarded with suspicion. Supposing therefore for example, that either the unlawfulness of divorce, as hitherto understood in morals; or the lawfulness of capital punishment according to the civil law; or the doctrine of inspiration, as taught by church authority,—should, by scientific deduction, be proved to be unfounded, it would be inadmissible to prohibit the open avowal that such deduction had been made.

We come, *thirdly*, to the inquiry, is an individual who discerns the falsehood of a position or precept hitherto recognized by authority as true, justified in renouncing his own personal obligation to obey the same? According to the general notion of freedom, it would appear that he is justified; for since absolute obedience to inward conviction is the very essential of freedom, it would seem an inroad on his freedom, to hold him bound to the observance of that which he conceives to be false. But it must here also be taken into the account, that authority itself forms one amongst the reasonable arguments of free conduct; because it is the result of the accumulated knowledge of a former period. If, therefore, an individual in his examination of this result discover an error, it is certainly his duty to point it out to the investigation of all; but, as he has no right to consider his own judgment infallible, it is not allowable for him at once to release himself from the obligation to observe, in practice, that which he deems to be erroneous: he must, on the contrary, wait till that which he has advanced shall have stood the test of scientific examination, and shall have received confirmation from other competent judges. Modesty, benevolence, and respect for the convictions of the intelligent and the learned, would dictate such a line of conduct. And if there exist a possibility of error in the decisions of the entire body of scientific men, and if, in consequence of this liability to err, truth must ever remain open to free examination, the individual will not be inclined to lay claim to infallibility, or to leave out of the consideration the possibility of error in his own views.

An individual is therefore by no means justified in at once renouncing his obligation to obey a precept which he believes to be false: for, as he ought to reverence, as an intelligent authority, that general opinion which recognizes the precept as just, he is bound to regulate his conduct in obedience to this authority, until his own differing view shall have gained the sanction and confirmation of the learned. This is doubly important, if the practical disregard of the precept would involve the violation of moral, civil or religious order, and disturb the peace and well-being of society. If an individual be convinced that the prohibition of polygamy is not founded in Scripture, in reason, or in nature, he is at liberty to make known the grounds of his conviction, but not to take two wives. Or if an individual be convinced that a law of the land is unjust, he is free to set forth and publish the grounds of his conviction; but so long as the law continues in force, he cannot, on his own responsibility, release himself from the obligation to obey it. Or if a clergyman be convinced that the baptism of infants is an unmeaning ceremony, he is fully justified in writing and speaking publicly on the subject, but not in denying to children the administration of this ceremony. He must conform to the existing regulations of his church, until his own view of baptism shall be admitted by theologians in general, and shall be practically adopted.

But what is our duty, if obedience to that which has hitherto been sanctioned and maintained by authority, but which we hold to be false, shall include, on our parts, the commission of a sin against our conscience? Are we, in such circumstances, to wait for the often long-delayed sanction and confirmation of authority, or are we justified in at once refusing our obedience?

It is scarcely probable that such a case will present itself, in relation to moral doctrine; though it may easily arise with respect to the civil law, and makers of religious belief. If, for example, a civil judge be convinced that it is sinful—nay, criminal—to punish with death, or imprisonment for life, one who is guilty of an error in faith, is he justified in pronouncing such a sentence, and in permitting its execution? We reply that he is not justified. And if a Christian be convinced that Christ is not God, but a mere man, and that to render him divine honour and worship is an offence against God, is he justified in immediately relinquishing his obedience to authority, in a case where compliance (according to his opinion) involves the breaking of the first commandment? This question must, we think, be answered in the affirmative. And the reason why independent conduct is, in every such instance, to be approved, is simply this—because an obligation to act in opposition to duty does not, and cannot exist. That which is established by social authority, is ever established with the expressed, or understood, presumption that conformity does not include injustice or sin; and consequently, in every case where the contrary proves to be the fact, authority instantly ceases to be binding.

E. R. B.

PSALM CVI. Verses 9th, 12th, 13th, 14th, 15th.

"He rebuked the Red Sea also, and it was dried up; so he led them through the depths as through the wilderness."
"Then believed they his words; they sang his praise.
"They soon forgat his works; they waited not for his counsel:
"But lusted exceedingly in the wilderness, and tempted God in the desert.
"And he gave them their request; *but sent leanness into their soul.*"

Led by the hand divine, through mazy depths
Of that vast desert, on they journeyed;
And the ineffable light—the Spirit of God—
Shone on their path, and blest the devious way:
They needed not, that the all-teeming earth,
For them should pour her gladdening oil and wine:
Nor, that Arabian gales with spicy breath
Should cool their brows, or bathe their wearied limbs—
Still less they needed that the gorgeous pomp,
Of King or Satrap—or the luxury
Of heated cities, should before them rise—

Lifting the imaginative thought, holy and high,
The presence of their God, was to their hearts,
Gladness, and wine.—That glow—that generous glow,
Urged the warm current, through their swelling veins,
Their noble brows were elevate from earth,
Depravity of toil extinct for them—
They fainted not, sinking beneath the sun—
A band of choral priests they journeyed on,
O'er fervid sands, beneath that sultry sky—
For *He* was there—His wreathy column led
Their troops by day, and when the darkness fell
Bright as the chrysolite shone, with living flame;
They fed on thought!—they lived on high desires!—
Were nourished by the immediate sense of God—
But they were wearied of that heavenly food:
They loathed this Manna—and their abject hearts
Clung to the greedy zests of common clay—

They would have flesh!—the flesh-pots of that land;
That land of bodily thrall and moral death,—
The flesh-pots of that land their villainous sense
Yearned after—in the holy fold of God.

He gave them their request!
Earth sent her gifts—her swarming tribes
Her fatness and her richness—and they fed;
Till their eyes swilled and their extenuate frames
Temples of thoughts devout, of high desires,
Were sunk and softened to luxurious ease.

They slumbered deep, and heavy, and arose
The feasting to renew, and to rejoice in the fat sweetness—
He gave them their request! the physical sense
Had its desire—They ate and they were filled,
But leanness came upon their souls.

That light—which as a garment fair and beautiful
Had clothed their outward seeming—darkened—
The generous purpose, the confiding faith,
The calm clear thought, the peace ineffable,
The better world—in this world—dimned and lost,
Divinest inspiration bartered for—the worthless carnal,—
Their hearts by generous feeling urged no more,
Earth's baser stimulants supplied the place;
Clouded the soul—its vast imaginings,
Drowsy, sick, faint, dark, dull, and animal,
And oh the curse!—
In this, their second state, they were content.—

ART. IV.—HERESIES OF SAMUEL TAYLOR COLERIDGE.*

ALL mankind feel that there is a peculiar value in independent Testimony.† The opinion of an unpledged man carries on the face of it more weight than that of a pledged man. If a Bishop produces a defence of any Dogma which is maintained by his Church, the only value to be attached to his opinion is that which is derived from the ascertained strength of his arguments. But if a Layman of celebrity assert his belief in the same Dogma, there is a power in the mere fact of his belief independently of any argument which he may think proper to adduce. The simple announcement of the Bishop's opinion would go for nothing, because men presume that he holds it, or know at least that as an honest man he ought to hold it. But a similar announcement from a layman of acknowledged intellect, though he declare not a single reason for his having formed the opinion, is, *ipso facto*, a presumption, nay, according to the logic of some minds, is an argument in its favour.

When Archdeacon Paley published his admirable Treatise on Natural Theology, no one could have attached the slightest importance to the fact that a beneficed clergyman of the Church of England professed his belief in the existence of a God. The real and only power of this declaration of his belief consisted in the strength and beauty of the arguments by which it was supported. But when Lord Brougham, a Lord High Chancellor of England, a man of acute understanding, of varied powers, of bold and masculine habits of reasoning, a man going so far in the course of free inquiry, as to labour under a very extensive suspicion of Scepticism—a man, who according to conventional opinion, scarcely need have had any belief at all—when this man comes voluntarily forward with no class object to promote, but on the contrary, as it were, stepping out of his way and calling, to tell the world that from mature and patient reflection, he too believes in the force of Paley's argument, and is convinced of the existence of an infinitely good, wise, and powerful Being—then there is a weight attached to the mere announcement of this conviction, which could not have existed in the Archdeacon's case; and men who would have had to look into Paley's book to gain any distinct conviction from it, in favour of the existence of a God, now actually carry away with them, without turning over a single page of Lord Brougham's Dissertations, an impression of the truth of the general position, deepened, according to the degree of their estimation, for the author, by this independent Testimony. For they say immediately, "Why here is Lord Brougham, a man of strong intellect, without a single motive of interest or fear, almost without a prejudice on the subject, without the slightest necessity, conventionally speaking, for having any opinion on the matter at all—here is this man coming forward before his Maker and his fellow creatures, and solemnly declaring his firm and earnest belief in the leading tenet of our Religion."

---

* The following article was designed for our October Number, but came to hand too late.

† We use the word Testimony here, not in its accurate Theological sense, but in its popular and Scriptural one, of "bearing witness to the Truth."

In connection with this remark, no one can forget the additional instances afforded in matters of Christian doctrine by the well known opinions of Locke. Here was the independent Philosopher and Metaphysician, the Political Economist and Statist, without a link connecting him with the Theological institutions of his country, (the solitary one that ever did so connect him being but an educational one, and long since broken through, in his ejection from his studentship of Christ Church,) sending forth from the office of his commissionership of Trade and Plantations the "Reasonableness of Christianity, as delivered in the Scriptures," leaving behind him, too, MSS. in abundance commenting on various portions of those Scriptures.

Had it not been that Bacon's conduct prevented the effect being produced, his Moral Essays would in a similar way have been invested with peculiar impressiveness, from the mere fact of his greatness in the departments of Physics and Evidence. Milton, though more of a Theologian to appearance than many others, was yet unconnected with Theology as a profession, and achieved such a vast independent fame for mighty intellect, that the same disposition to lean towards his religious convictions, as having a peculiar trustworthiness about them, is not unnaturally felt by many. Newton is another instance that cannot be passed over, of great independent mental power giving a peculiar authority to opinions on Theology. This may be servile and illogical—only the resort of minds ignorant of the real bearings of a question; but we are not characterizing, we are merely stating the fact.

Even the Denomination in our country professing, and as it appears to us possessing a considerable share of independent feeling, and a less disposition than is common to rest upon mere authority, in subjects of Faith, has yet not been able to resist the contagion of this weakness, or to pass by unnoticed the honour which it possesses of having the glance of such great minds as these directed with approbation to the main features of its faith; and accordingly the names of Milton, Locke, and Newton, as Unitarians, it has assiduously wafted to the extremities of the Sectarian World.

It is therefore with the less surprise that we witness an eagerness among other Religionists to catch any independent lustre of great names that may fall within the limits of their horizon. Generally speaking, and considering the greater numbers of her communion, our English Church has not been rich in this independent and *ab extra* satisfaction with her tenets. The great defenders of her peculiar faith have for the most part arisen from her own loins. We have many Bishops signalized for their able and successful warfare by her side, (though we cannot but remember that when the greater part of their service was rendered they were usually Bishops-aspirant, rather than Bishops actual,) but we cannot call to mind any long list of men, who, having achieved for themselves a world-wide fame, on independent grounds, applied themselves at last to expositions of the Athanasian Creed, the doctrine of the Atonement, or the doctrine of the Trinity. Without in the slightest degree, therefore, impeaching the motives of many of those who within the Church have thus signalized themselves, (for nothing is at once so easy and so cowardly as to attribute interested motives where there is no proof,) it yet appears that however much orthodoxy may boast of great Church names among those who have written in its support, it certainly cannot reckon among them very many of those who have achieved for themselves an independent and a universal fame. Shakspeare, unfortunately, did not signalize himself in Theology, and Milton, still more unfortunately, did. Pope, if he were anything, was, we fear, a Catholic; and Byron thought that if it had been his fate to sit at the feet of Dr. Southwood Smith, instead of at the altar of his hereditary religion, in early life, he should have been a better man and a better Christian.* The Church is not more fortunate in the few philosophical names which we have already quoted.

But the heading of this article will sufficiently indicate why we have introduced the names of Poets.—Because at length a great Poet has made a sign, and as it is thought of the true cross order. Now we will yield to none in reverence for Coleridge. The man who can read the Ancient Mariner, the Christabel, and the Genevieve, and then feel a grudge against Coleridge because he was a Churchman and a Tory, deserves to have a bonfire made of every Poet that lies upon his shelves. We do full homage to the splendour of Coleridge's genius,—we rejoice and think it an honour to be of the same soil that gave him birth. If any, however, might feel pain at Coleridge's Church of England predilections, we might be permitted to do so. For did our habits or our modes of judging allow us to use the language which is so often employed towards those who have left their communions, we might use the miserable privilege of disappointed party-spirit, and call him Renegade. But in truth, if we expressed such a feeling, we should have to feign it, for our heart is full of nothing but the tenderest respect for his memory, and it is with soft and melancholy, not irritated feelings, that we go back to the time when Coleridge, then an Unitarian, stood up in the pulpit of one of the old and venerable Presbyterian Foundations of this country, and with the old board of the Royal arms on one side of him, (the mystery and marvel of our chapel-going childhood, bringing to mind the times of persecution, though in fact the royal pledge of protection to the worshippers,) and above him the iron stanchions stretching across the roof to keep the old walls from falling, opened his lips and said, "Hallelujah! for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth!"—and then raising his whole audience to the height of his own contemplation, carried them on, till the great theme, in human words at least, was spent, and then all fell down with him spontaneously to prayer. Here was a Poet-Preacher, and no wonder that the weekly task, and the necessary descent from Poetry, as an habitual foundation, to the firmer ground of reason, ere long disgusted him, and drove him to find in the fitful, changeful sea of Politics a subject for more passionate interest, and in the mysterious haunts of orthodoxy, a realm for his poetic temperament, unchecked by too stern a reason, to roam in, when and where it listed.

---

* See Medwin.

In all this we see a very possible, a very natural concurrence of events; and while we think that with a less wild and fanciful Theology for his excitable imagination to wander in, the flame of his Poesy might have burned purer, and the tenor of his life been evener, and one of the very few founts of bitterness in his heart been entirely closed, yet all this is not for us to determine, and we should as soon think of arraigning the course of Providence, as blaming him for following the bent of his own feelings and convictions.

We would, then, without hesitation, say, let Coleridge's independent testimony to the popular opinions go for what it is worth. Let him by all means be valued by the Church as what he is—an accession to the number of famed and yet independent advocates of its doctrines. Had he remained a Unitarian, we for our parts should have been proud and happy in the continued light of his countenance shed on the mirror of what we deem a more heavenly truth. But in the mode in which they have sought the sanction of Coleridge's name for orthodox opinions, his admirers have fallen into the most ludicrous misapprehensions. They appear to have taken for granted that because Coleridge had a Poet's or a Metaphysician's faith in the Trinity, that he thereby bound down his fine understanding to the whole string of dogmas with which the profession of this particular article of faith is usually accompanied. Were we to live to the age of Methuselah, we could not hope for a more apposite and curious illustration of this statement, than that afforded in a Lecture lately published by a clergyman from the neighbourhood of Liverpool.* The object of that Lecture is to convict Unitarians of defective scholarship, or dishonest or uncandid criticism. The main ground of this charge is the various supposed mutilations and mistranslations of Scripture sanctioned by the Improved Version, a book held to be in repute as a translation of the Scriptures among the Unitarians of England. And first, under the head of the first charge, namely, "unjustifiable mutilation of the Sacred Text," stands in this Lecture the well-known fact, that this version marks as doubtful, though it does not reject, the two first chapters of St. Luke's Gospel, and the greater part of the two first of St. Matthew's also. This "mutilation" is also the chief charge in reference to their regard for the Sacred text, brought against Unitarians, in the whole controversy of which this Lecture forms a part.

At the very commencement of the Lecture, of which the above is the first and leading position attempted to be established, stands as a bulwark of the true orthodox faith, the name of Coleridge. "To use the language," says the Lecturer, "of an illustrious man, once himself a Unitarian preacher, 'It appears to me impossible for any man to read the New Testament, with the common exercise of an unbiassed understanding, without being convinced of the Divinity of Christ, from the testimony of almost every page.'" Now this quotation might read very suitably almost anywhere, except, unfortunately, in that precise place in which it appears. It is a pity that the Lecturer did not hand it over to any of his colleagues in this Controversy—except, indeed, to Dr. Tattershall, to whom it would have been almost as unfortunate as to himself. For of course the reader would trust that an authority thus prominently introduced, must be at least orthodox on the main matter to be brought under his attention.

---

* Lecture by Rev. Thomas Byrth, M. A., &c., Rector of Wallasey. The importance attached to Coleridge's opinion by this gentleman is further evident by his reference to him a second time in the same Lecture. See Liverpool Controversy, p. 123.

We have observed in the Protestant Churches of the continent, as well as in some of the Dissenting Chapels of England, the custom to prevail of affixing in front of the pulpit the number of the Hymn which the congregation was singing, for the information of those who might not have heard it given out. It would have been curious if while the learned Lecturer was quoting at the outset, the unimpeached authority of Coleridge, as justifying his part in the crusade against the Liverpool Heretics, and then proceeding to show how utterly untrustworthy and dishonourable Unitarian criticism, especially on the introductory chapters of St. Matthew and St. Luke, was—some one had taken the trouble, for the enlightenment of his audience, of affixing to the front of his pulpit, a transcript in large characters, of the following extract from Coleridge's Literary Remains:

A Specimen of Coleridge's "Defective Scholarship, or Dishonest or Uncandid Criticism."

"Having now overpassed six-sevenths of the ordinary period allotted to human life—resting my whole and sole hope of salvation and immortality on the divinity of Christ, and the redemption by his cross and passion, and holding the doctrine of the Triune God as the very ground and foundation of the Gospel Faith,—I feel myself enforced by conscience to declare and avow, that, in my deliberate judgment, *the Christopædia prefixed to the third Gospel, and concorporated with the first, but according to my belief, in its present form, the latest of the four, was unknown to, or not recognized by, the Apostles Paul and John;* and that, instead of supporting the doctrine of the Trinity, and the Filial Godhead of the Incarnate Word, as set forth by John, i. 1., and by Paul, it, if not altogether irreconcilable with this faith, doth yet greatly weaken and bedim its evidence: and that, *by the too palpable contradictions between the narrative in the first Gospel, and that in the third,* it has been a fruitful magazine of doubts respecting the historic character of the Gospels themselves. I have read most of the criticisms on this text, and my impression is, that no learned Jew can be expected to receive the common interpretation as the true primary sense of the words. The severely literal Aquila renders the Hebrew word νεᾶνις. But were it asked of me; Do you then believe our Lord to have been the son of Mary by Joseph? I reply: it is a point of religion with me to have no belief one way or the other. I am in this way like St. Paul, more than content not to know Christ himself κατὰ σάρκα. It is enough for me to know, that the Son of God *became flesh,* σὰρξ ἐγένετο γενόμενος ἐκ γυναικὸς, and more than this, it appears to me, *was unknown to the Apostles*, or, if known, not taught by them, as appertaining to a saving faith in Christ."—Oct. 1831. *Lit. Rem.* iii. 102.

Finding so much importance attached to the opinions of Coleridge on Theological matters, we have been at the pains of collecting a few more specimens, which it may not be unacceptable to our readers to lay before them. Could we hope that an eye of the correct orthodox power of vision would fall upon our pages, we might hope that the fact of such free opinions being held by a man so unquestionably orthodox and religious as Coleridge, might enlarge the scope of its discernment, and enable it to see that the distortion which is so often regarded as peculiar to Unitarian eyes is shared by many clear-sighted and candid Christians. To ourselves, these extracts only show what we never doubted, that Trinitarianism may exist in a moderate form, as a metaphysical doctrine, without injuring the charities of life, without lighting the fires of zealous indignation, and most assuredly without involving its professors in that gross misapprehension of the nature of the Bible, with which it is almost so universally coupled in these our fortunate and happy isles.

But we proceed with our extracts, which we shall endeavour to make with perfect fairness, so as to connect with them the qualifications which the author himself may make; and we will select first some that bear upon the question already started, of the authority of certain portions of Scripture.

*Jehudi's Penknife in the hands of Mr. Coleridge.**

"The man who verily and sincerely believes the narrative in St. John's Gospel, of the feeding of five thousand persons with a few loaves and small fishes, and of the raising of Lazarus, in the plain and literal sense, cannot be reasonably suspected of rejecting or doubting any narrative concerning Christ and his apostles, simply as miraculous. I trust, therefore, that no disbelief of, or prejudice against, miraculous events and powers will be attributed to me, as the ground or cause of *my strong persuasion that the latter verses of the last chapter of St. Mark's Gospel were an additament of a later age,* for which St. Luke's Acts of the Apostles misunderstood supplied the hints."—*Lit. Rem.* iii. 48.

---

* In the late Liverpool Controversy, to which allusion has been already made, the Rev. Dr. Tattershall, one of the Christ Church Lecturers, took as his text the following remarkable passage from Jeremiah: "And it came to pass that when Jehudi had read three or four leaves (that is, of Jeremiah's Prophecy) he cut it with the penknife, and cast it into the fire that was on the hearth, until all the roll was consumed in the fire that was on the hearth." Jer. xxxvi. 23. It is not a little singular that a man who understands so well, and can state so ably the laws of critical evidence as Dr. Tattershall, should select as a description of the process by which certain portions of Scripture are rejected by Mr. Coleridge and others, a passage which could countenance none but the most vulgar and ignorant notions (prevalent enough already without any further encouragement) on the mode in which these matters are decided. It seemed as if he desired to convey to his audience an idea that Unitarians studied their principles of criticism under the tutorship of Messrs. Rogers of Sheffield.

The Epistle to the Hebrews.

"I do not believe St. Paul to be the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Luther's conjecture is very probable, that it was by Apollos, an Alexandrian Jew. The plan is too studiously regular for St. Paul. It was evidently written during the yet existing glories of the Temple. For three hundred years the church did not affix St. Paul's name to it; but its apostolical or Catholic character, independently of its genuineness as to St. Paul, was never much doubted."—*Table Talk,* i. 21.

Mr. Coleridge of course rejects the text of the Three Heavenly Witnesses; he also seems to allow the penknife to hover over parts of Daniel. But in the latter case, mark the beautiful and true-hearted sentiment into which, we were going to say, he is betrayed; but we do not dishonour him so far as to say that such a sentiment would be at all inconsistent with his orthodoxy, for this could not dispossess him of the large heart he always carried about him.

The Seat of Christianity.

"Whatever may be thought of the genuineness or authority of any part of the book of Daniel, it makes no difference in my belief in Christianity: for Christianity is within a man, even as he is a being gifted with reason; it is associated with your mother's chair, and with the first-remembered tones of her blessed voice."—*Table Talk,* i. 21.

Let the reader take as further specimens of the free and manly mind that Coleridge brought to his religion, the following miscellaneous extracts, the spirit pervading which will ever prevent him from being properly ranked among the supporters of the strait-laced, literal and timid orthodoxy of the present day.

Text—Sparring.

"When I hear (as who now can travel twenty miles in a stage coach without the probability of hearing) an ignorant religionist quote an unconnected sentence of half a dozen words from any part of the Old or New Testament, and resting on the literal sense of these words the eternal misery of all who reject, nay, even of all those countless myriads who have never had the opportunity of accepting this, and sundry other articles of faith conjured up by the same textual magic; I ask myself what idea these persons form of the Bible, that they would use it in a way in which they themselves use no other book? They deem the whole written by inspiration. Well: but is the very essence of rational discourse, that is connection and dependency, done away, because the discourse is infallibly rational? The mysteries which these spiritual lynxes detect in the simplest texts, remind one of the 500 nondescripts, each as large as his own black cat, which Dr. Katterfelto, by aid of his solar microscope, discovered in a drop of transparent water. But to a contemporary who has not thrown his lot in the same helmet with them, these fanatics think it a crime to listen. Let them then, or far rather, let those who are in danger of infection from them, attend to the golden aphorisms of the old and orthodox divines. 'Sentences in Scripture (says Dr. Donne), like hairs in horses' tails, concur in one root of beauty and strength; but being plucked out, one by one, serve only for springs and snares.' The second I transcribe from the preface to Lightfoot's works: 'Inspired writings are an inestimable treasure to mankind; for so many sentences, so many truths. But then the true sense of them must be known: otherwise, so many sentences, so many authorized falsehoods.' "—*Literary Remains*, vol. i. p. 320.

The spirit, not the letter.

"It is my profound conviction that St. John and St. Paul were divinely inspired; but I totally disbelieve the dictation of any one word, sentence or argument throughout their writings. Observe, there was revelation." . . . . "John and Paul each dealt with those revelations, expounded them, insisted on them, just exactly according to his own natural strength of intellect, habit of reasoning, moral and even physical temperament."—*Table Talk*, vol. ii. p. 31.

Coleridge's Views on the existence of an Evil Spirit.

"I entered into a long discourse with him about the devil, the original of him, his rebellion against God, his enmity to men, the reason of it, his setting himself up in the dark parts of the world to be worshipped instead of God, &c. This extract is from Robinson Crusoe, and Coleridge makes the following remarks upon it. 'I presume that Milton's Paradise Lost must have been bound up with one of Crusoe's Bibles: otherwise I should be puzzled to know where he found all this history of the old Gentleman. Not a word of it in the Bible itself, I am quite sure. But to be serious. De Foe did not reflect that all these difficulties are attached to a mere fiction, or, at the best, an allegory supported by a few popular phrases and figures of speech used incidentally or dramatically by the Evangelists; and that the existence of a personal, intelligent, evil being, the counterpart and antagonist of God, is in direct contradiction to the most express declarations of Holy Writ. "Shall there be evil in a city, and the Lord hath not done it?" Amos, iii. 6. "I make peace and create evil." Isa. xlv. 7. This is the deep mystery of the abyss of God.' "—*Lit. Rem.* vol. i. p. 194.

Witch of Endor.

"The text (1 Sam. xxviii.) is a simple record of the facts, the solution of which the sacred historian leaves to the reader. I take it to have been a trick of ventriloquism, got up by the courtiers and friends of Saul, to prevent him, if possible, from hazarding an engagement with an army despondent and oppressed with bodings of defeat."—*Table Talk*, i. 47.

Unorthodox Weakness.

" Merciful Heaven! Eternal misery and the immitigable wrath of God, and the inextinguishable fire of hell amid devils, parricides, and haters of God and all goodness, this is the verdict which a Protestant Divine passes against the man, who though sincerely believing the whole Nicene Creed and every doctrine and precept taught in the New Testament, and living accordingly, should yet have convinced himself that the first chapters of St. Matthew and St. Luke were not parts of the original Gospels!"—*Lit. Rem.* iii. 69.

The Sabbath.

" How grossly misunderstood the genuine character of the Christian Sabbath or Lord's Day, seems to be even by the Church. To confound it with the Jewish Sabbath, or to rest its observance upon the fourth commandment, is, in my judgment, heretical, and would so have been considered in the primitive church."—*Table Talk*, vol. ii. 313.

Christ peccable.

"That his (Christ's) humanity had a *capacity* of sin, follows from its own essence. He was of like passions as we, and was tempted. How *could* he be tempted, if he had no formal capacity of being seduced?" *Table Talk*, vol. ii. p. 240.

The Deluge.

" I confess I have small patience with Mr. Grenville Penn's book against Buckland. Science will be superseded, if every phenomenon is referred in this manner to an actual miracle. I think it absurd to attribute so much to the Deluge. An inundation which left an olive tree standing, and bore up the ark peacefully on its bosom, could scarcely have been the sole cause of the rents and dislocations observable on the face of the earth. How could the tropical animals, which have been discovered in England and Russia in a perfectly natural state, have been transported thither by such a flood? These animals must evidently have been natives of the countries in which they have been found."—*Table Talk*, vol. i. p. 51.

Ecclesiastes.

" Hebrew in point of force and purity, seems at its height in Isaiah. It is most corrupt in Daniel, and not much less so in Ecclesiastes; which I cannot believe to have been actually composed by Solomon, but rather suppose to have been so attributed by the Jews in their passion for ascribing all works of that sort to their *Grand Monarque*."—*Table Talk*, vol. i. p. 51.

Psalms.

" You know my veneration for the book of Psalms, or most of it; but with some half dozen exceptions, the Psalms are surely not adequate vehicles of Christian thanksgiving and joy."—*Table Talk,* vol. i. p. 164.

The Garden of Eden and the Serpent symbolical.

" The Second Chapter of Genesis from verse 4, and the third chapter, are to my mind as evidently symbolical as the first chapter is literal."—*Lit. Rem.* ii. 401.

Miracles.

" That fashion of modern Theologists which would convert miracles from a motive to attention and solicitous examination, and at best from a negative condition of revelation, into the positive foundation of Christian faith."—*Lit. Rem.* vol. iii. 72.

We now take leave of our delightful, but also as we fear, after what we have quoted from him, our heretical Friend—" the old man eloquent." We should indeed have sorrowed if such a mind as that of Coleridge could have fallen into much of the ignorant cant so prevalent at present in the religious world, and we proportionably rejoice therefore at these throbbings of his mighty heart rising up from beneath the weight of superincumbent prejudice with which his cause is for the most part so sadly burdened.*

C. W

---

* We give the following passage from Coleridge's Literary Remains, on the authority of a correspondent, in whose accuracy we have confidence:—

" If the party calling themselves Evangelical had the sole power in this country, would it be a country fit to live in; who would not rather live at Algiers?—Ed.

ART. V.—THE INTEGRITY OF THE CANON OF HOLY SCRIPTURE MAINTAINED AGAINST UNITARIAN OBJECTIONS. By Rev. THOMAS TATTERSHALL, D.D. Liverpool: Henry Perris.*

IN the 36th chapter of Jeremiah, we have an account of the manner in which Jehoiakim, a wicked and presumptuous King of Judah, burnt in a fire the roll containing denunciations of that prophet against him. As Jeremiah was known to be a prophet, and as the book destroyed contained a solemn warning to the king, it was an act, not only of great presumption, but actually of rebellion against God, to destroy it. The act is neither to be justified nor palliated, and Dr. Tattershall cannot condemn it in stronger terms than I would do; but yet that roll was not acknowledged Scripture. It was not part of the law handed down from former times; it was a new revelation or prophecy, the authority of which was not acknowledged by the king and his counsellors; and therefore it is not a case similar to that it was applied to, and I cannot but think that Dr. Tattershall showed a want of candour in choosing it as a preamble to his sermon.

For what is it that he charges upon the Unitarians (supposing him to be correct in all his charges)? Not that they reject the prophets or Apostles, and contemptuously destroy *all* their writings, but that not admitting certain doctrines inferred from these writings, they reject those portions on which they rest,—he may, indeed, wish it to be understood, that they would gradually object to other parts, till they virtually destroyed, or rendered of no weight, the whole Scripture, but this is what I deem uncandid, for no Unitarian writer whatever can be adduced as speaking contemptuously of Scripture, or showing any desire to get rid of it, except on the ground of want of evidence for its authenticity. I am not inclined to advocate the wisdom and correctness of those who have rejected portions of Scripture, which are received by Christians in general, but to make it a case parallel to that of Jehoiakim, it should be shown that the persons who have thus mutilated the Scriptures, were men of evil lives, who had a motive for getting rid of what would condemn their conduct, or interfere with their interests. The Unitarian writers who have done most in the way objected to, are, the Rev. Thomas Belsham, the known author of the "Improved Version," as it was, I think, unwisely and improperly called, and the Rev. Edward Evanson, who reduced his Canon of Scripture, within very narrow bounds, acknowledging as genuine, if I recollect rightly, only the Gospel of Luke, the Acts, and some of St. Paul's Epistles. I shall not defend the opinions of either gentleman, for I do not admit them as true; but I say the man who could, *with a knowledge of circumstances,* compare either of them with Jehoiakim, or who could extend this to the whole body of Unitarian Christians, men, if any are so, *Nullius addicti jurare in verba magistri,* is guilty of a foul aspersion on the character of his neighbours.

---

* We should not allow any pen that had been drawn in the late Liverpool Controversy, to enter again into the contest, unless some new matter appeared from the opposite side; but we are exceedingly happy in being able to insert the following strictures, from one whose name, were we at liberty to divulge it, would give authority to his statements.—ED.

The only excuse I can make for Dr. Tattershall, is that he knew nothing of the men or of the circumstances, and that prejudiced against what they had done, he rashly compared it with the impiety of the Jewish king; and like others in still higher stations, chose to attribute to a body, what was the act of an individual, because some members of that body belonged to a society, by which the book was published. Now who were these Jehoiakims? Thomas Belsham,—a man brought up a strict Calvinist—who was for many years at the head of a collegiate institution for educating Calvinistic ministers amongst the Dissenters; and who, whilst seeking for arguments to confirm and teach the doctrines he was attached to, was shaken in his belief of them, and after long struggling against his conviction, felt himself constrained to admit his inability to prove them, and therefore, as an honest and conscientious man, resigned the situation he held, a situation of honour and emolument, and threw himself on the world. He indeed soon found a place of refuge,—he was gladly received by those whose opinions he had adopted—he had their sympathy, and as far as possible their support, but they had nothing to offer equal to what he might have had, if he had continued in his orthodox opinions. He certainly did not choose the way to worldly advantages. When Mr. Belsham once threw off his trammels, when he had got rid of the creed in which he had been educated, he became a bold and fearless inquirer, and he saw no reason to conceal his opinions. His situation engaged him in controversy, and he was a keen and ardent disputant, not always weighing his words, so as to avoid giving offence; but he was well known to an extensive circle of relatives and friends, as a man of the kindest and most benevolent feelings, of the strictest integrity and of most unblamable life. If sectarian violence should deny him the name of *Christian*, it would have to acknowledge that few admitted Christians lead lives so conformable to the precepts of their Divine Master. This Mr. Belsham, whose life was spent in the study of Scripture, considering the present version as incorrect, and that of Archbishop Newcome as coming nearer to the original, set about a republication of the Archbishop's translation, with some changes that he thought desirable, and with notes. His object was to assist unlearned Christians, and to enable them to judge of what Unitarian critics and others had suggested. The committee of a Society, that had been formed for the distribution of Tracts, thought the work important, and assisted in the printing and circulation of it. The work was never spoken of, or treated as a book free from errors—it was, I believe, in no case, certainly in scarcely any, admitted into the pulpit, and no Unitarian considered himself as bound to receive anything it contained, except so far as his own judgment might concur with it. It is a well known fact, that many Unitarians at the time questioned the propriety of many alterations. Yet this is the man, and this the case which Dr. Tattershall has compared to Jehoiakim!

He has not, I think, referred to Mr. Evanson, who went further; perhaps he never heard of him—at all events, the Unitarian Society had not printed his work, and therefore he could not charge it upon the body. Still let us inquire who was Mr. Evanson? A man brought up a member of the Established Church, to which Dr. Tattershall also belongs, educated at the University of Cambridge, ordained a minister of that Church, and for some time holding preferment in it. What worldly motive had he for adopting Unitarianism? *Wealth?* He lived in comparative poverty and obscurity; he never completely joined the Dissenting body, or accepted of the ministry amongst them—and never received any pecuniary aid. *Fame?* He was abused both by those he forsook, and by those who were like himself, Unitarians; by the latter, because he dared to think for himself and go further than they;—he was honoured only by the small consistent band, who value the conscientious upright man, though he may differ from themselves, and who believing none infallible, can see without alarm, opinions, however strange, satisfied that if false, they will be confuted. *Freedom from the restraints of religion?* Though he reduced his canonical books, he got rid of none of its doctrines—he was a zealous and steady follower of the *precepts* of Jesus Christ—and if he did not admit all the writings usually contained in the New Testament, it was because he thought he found inconsistencies which were calculated to stagger the faith of diligent inquirers, and want of sufficient evidence of their genuineness. I do not defend the opinions of Mr. Evanson, but I maintain that he was a man who would do honour to any faith, and most unlike a Jehoiakim.

Having made the preceding remarks, suggested by what I may call the preface, I proceed to the heads—and here I am disposed to admit the whole of what Dr. Tattershall states under his first head—viz. to *explain what is meant by the canon of Holy Scripture.* He perhaps rather strains matters to bear upon a particular case, but it is not worth disputing,—I, as one Unitarian, ask no more than he has granted.

The second head is to show the duty of preserving the Canon of Scripture in its integrity. So far as the Trinitarian Controversy or any other Controversy amongst Christians is concerned, I would scarcely object to what Dr. Tattershall has laid down. If I admit the authority of the book, I must admit that of the whole book, unless, as in the text of the heavenly witnesses, I have reason to believe it has been interpolated, or in any other case provided for under the first head. But I apprehend that while Dr. Tattershall is laying down a rule with a view to a particular case, he is involving himself and all Christians in difficulties of another kind. Still, as I do not wish to wander from the main point in view, I admit Dr. Tattershall's rule, and I am sure that few, if any Unitarians, would object to the authority of any of the writers of Scripture, in any matter of doctrine, when once satisfied that the book is genuine, and to be received as Scripture. Whether the present Canon is well constructed, or whether all the books included in it are of equal authority, i. e. equally proved to be divinely inspired, is another question. So far as the controversy is concerned, I freely admit them. It must have been either from fear of not being able to make his discourse of sufficient length, or from fear that Mr. James or Mr. Davies would not give so satisfactory an account of it, that Dr. Tattershall had recourse to the doctrine of the Trinity, which it properly belonged to those gentlemen to defend. In doing so he is very careful to maintain the *Unity* of God. It is indeed so clearly revealed in every part of Scripture—so confirmed by the works of creation—that I do not wonder he is eager to maintain it: and I freely acknowledge, that I conceive this admission of the Unity, so conducive to many practical purposes, though not to all, that I regret the name Unitarian was ever adopted as a religious distinction, though it is now impossible to change it. Does not, however, Dr. Tattershall perceive, that so far he goes with the Unitarians, and that if they admit *this single, this exclusive object of all lawful adoration and worship,* receive all the commands of Christ as *his* commands, consider all the inspiration of the Holy Ghost as *his* inspiration, they do practically admit the three persons as much as he may be said practically to admit the Unity? Though I and other Unitarians may not be able to assent to the doctrine as stated by Dr. Tattershall, yet as he considers the three persons so united as to be only *one* object of adoration and worship; so I consider the *one* God as operating by his spirit, and as communicating this spirit without measure to Jesus Christ, so that I regard the commands of Christ as the commands of God, through him. What, I say, is the practical difference of our opinions, *i. e.* the difference with respect to any thing influencing our moral conduct? As to the doctrine of three persons, I only ask that Dr. Tattershall shall bring clear Scripture evidence of it—when he does so, it will be time enough to assent to it,—as yet, I have nothing but his assertion.

I proceed now to his third head, to point out in one or two prominent instances the manner in which the Canon of Scripture has been violated by Unitarians. In the version of Mr. Belsham called the Improved Version, before referred to, the greater part of the first and all the second chapter of Matthew, and also the two first chapters of Luke, except the introduction, are printed in italics, not as absolutely rejecting them, but to imply that they are less certain than the other parts; and the reasons for holding this opinion are stated in the notes. What stress is to be laid on this opinion is left to every individual. Of this Dr. Tattershall has taken advantage, and this is his proof of Unitarians violating the Canon of Scripture. Now I for one do not reject these passages, and I know many other Unitarians who do not reject them. They do not appear to me to be in any way inconsistent with the *humanity* of Jesus Christ, for no one can doubt the power of God to work a miracle, if he see fit to do so, and to an Arian worshipper of one God, there is no difficulty whatever. The desire, if it deserve the name of desire, to reject these verses, arose from a supposition of their being irreconcileable with each other, and with other histories, whilst they are not supported by allusions to them in other parts of Scripture, and are not applied to any purpose either by the writers themselves or any of the other of the early Christians. I do not think the difficulties so great as to be insuperable, and I feel so anxious to admit what has come to us connected with the rest of the books, that I know not how to draw a line so as to admit one part and reject another. But I cannot therefore consider those as dishonest who lay more stress on the rejection of them by early heretics than I do. As to the accounts Dr. Tattershall gives of the opinions of

Epiphanius and Jerome respecting the gospels used by the Ebionites, Marcion, &c. they are perhaps about as deserving of credit as what Dr. Tattershall and others write about the Unitarians. Controversialists seem to think every misrepresentation fair which would contribute to injure a sect which they appear to abhor, though when they have an object to gain they can address them as "my dear friends."

This doubt about the validity of these chapters is the only instance brought forward of Unitarian defalcation, and a stress is laid on them as if Unitarianism were affected by the admission of them, though Dr. Tattershall could not I think be ignorant, certainly he cannot now be ignorant, that the greater number of Unitarians admit them, and that none consider the admission or rejection of them as necessary to the Unitarian doctrine. Dr. Tattershall in his conclusion talks of the *sacrifice of intellectual pride* or of *self-righteous confidence*, and urges the necessity of conforming to the revealed will of God, of which he, like all other *infallible* teachers, is the judge. He gives a very good statement as to what the Bible is, and then begs the question by asserting that "it is *not* a mere changeable, uncertain, indeterminate thing, which we are at liberty to alter or modify in any manner whatever," intimating that Unitarians so consider it,—and thus ending, so far as his own language is concerned, by a false insinuation against his opponents.

Δ.

Art. VI.—NEW PUBLICATIONS.

I. Sketches of Married Life. By Mrs. Follen. London: John Green.

This is an English reprint of a very pleasing American tale. It is certainly no sketch of ideal life, and perhaps the actual is a little too unrelieved. It is in such a domestic story that we are made to feel the pervading differences between American and English modes of life. We had this feeling of strangeness in reading Miss Sedgwick's "Home." It was not an English home. We do not mean to object to it on that account; we mean that the differences which we now allude to, only as impressions, are worthy of a distinct statement and development, in any attempt to pourtray the circumstances and characters of the two nations. There will be no diversity, however, as to the beauty and moral truth of the following picture of home influence, and woman's leaning to the right:

"Dear Edward!" said his wife, "you have something on your mind; your brow looks troubled: what is it?"

"Only anxiety about business, Amy. How often have I wished that I had not been bred a merchant! But my mother said that it was a favourite wish of my father, that I should be an accomplished merchant."

"I have sometimes wished so too," answered his wife; "and then again, I remember, that the very evils which belong to your profession may be turned into good. He that has it in his power to do wrong with impunity, though he gains by it, yet chooses the right by which he loses, is the most eloquent preacher of righteousness."

"Very true, Amy: but sometimes this is indeed cutting off the right hand, and plucking out the right eye; and then thinking always about money and bargains has such a contracting influence upon one's mind!"

"But how often, Edward, have I heard you say that no man has such wide and various connexions with the human race, as a well-educated, upright, and active merchant! Every part of the world sends him its tribute of knowledge, as well as of riches. He sees men under all aspects; and while he may, with a certain degree of security, indulge in dishonesty, and be the enemy of his fellow men, perhaps no man can be so true, and self-sacrificing, and efficient a philanthropist, as a Christian merchant."

"It is not always so easy as you may imagine, for a merchant to act as remembering that he is under his great Task-master's eye."

"Not for all, or some men; but for you, Edward, the difficulty would be to act otherwise. When I think of your profession, Edward, it gives me pleasure to notice that merchants in general, as they acquire property more easily, are more disposed to spend it liberally."

"Yes," said Edward, as his eye kindled at the thought; "the greater proportion of our public benefactors have been merchants. Their money has given eyes to the blind, and ears to the deaf, health to the sick, and peace and comfort to the forsaken; it feeds and instructs the ignorant poor; it sends the glad tidings of salvation to the unbeliever and the penitent; it takes little children in its arms, and blesses them. But all this glorious power supposes wealth, Amy."

"And you, dear Edward, are rich enough to enjoy this highest of all privileges; to be the dispenser of good to others. You have cause only for thankfulness. But the poor, the unsuccessful merchant, who has not the means of educating his children, whose spirits are broken down by failures, and whose temper is soured by what he considers the injustice or dishonesty of others, perhaps even of his own friends; he is the man who, perhaps, may be excused for finding fault with his profession. My heart aches for him."

Edward started up, and walked hastily backward and forward through the room, as if he had been seized with some sudden and intolerable pain.

"What is the matter?" said his wife. "Are you ill?"

"Oh, nothing; nothing of consequence," said Edward. "I happened to think of something rather unpleasant then. It is late now, I believe, and my head aches."

They retired for the night. The next day, Edward looked depressed and thoughtful, and as if he had passed a sleepless night. Amy was troubled by his silence. This was the first cloud that had rested on her husband's brow since they were married.

"He has," she said to herself, "he has always confided every thing to me. He will tell me what it is that hangs so heavily upon his spirits. He will never shut me out from his sorrows, any more than his joys."

She thought, when he returned from the counting-house for the day, that he looked more free and happy, though he was still silent and thoughtful.

"Come and sit by me, Amy," said Edward to her, when they were alone in the evening.

Amy sat down by her husband.

"Do you not enjoy, Amy, our handsome house, and pictures, and carriage, &c.?"

"Surely, Edward; I take great pleasure in these things. But why do you ask?"

"And you love to have money enough to give to those who want it?"

"Why, what a question, Edward! You know I value this power more than I can tell."

"And can you voluntarily resign all these luxuries, Amy?"

"Why should I voluntarily resign them, Edward? What makes you so enigmatical? Tell me what you mean."

"Suppose that all the money which enables us to indulge ourselves in these luxuries, is not truly our own; what would you have me do, Amy?"

"Is it you, Edward, that asks me whether I would keep that which belongs to another? Is it you that asks me whether I would be dishonest?"

"But suppose, according to the law of the land, and the customs of society, and the tacit consent of those most interested, this property was secured to you?"

"When I am satisfied," said Amy, "that I can plead the law of the land, the customs of society, and the opinions of the world, before the judgment-seat of God, as an excuse for violating that higher law, which he has written on my heart, when I have placed the opinion of the world in the scales against my own self-respect, and found it the weightiest, then, Edward, I might hesitate. But why ask me such questions? Why do not you speak plainly?"

"I will, Amy," answered her husband. "When I failed in business before our marriage, I made a settlement with my creditors, by which I paid them seventy-five cents on a dollar. They knew that I paid them all I had, and signed a release from all further claims. Of late, my mind has been troubled about those debts, for such I consider them. A few days since, one of my creditors brought his son to me, a fine fellow, and asked me to take him into my store. He mentioned, in the course of conversation, that he had intended to send his son to College, for the boy had a thirst for learning; that he was in fact fitted to enter; but that he found he was too poor. 'If,' said the father, 'by denying myself everything but the necessaries of life, I could feed my boy's mind, I would thankfully do it; but I cannot honestly indulge myself even in this luxury.' I felt smitten to the heart. When I failed I owed that man 12,000 dollars. I paid him but nine. I now, of course owe him three, and the interest upon it. That sum would enable him to give his son the advantage which he so much desires. I have been thinking over the whole subject, and studying it fairly. Dymond's Essay would satisfy me, if I were not convinced before of what is right."

"And you will of course do it, Edward; there can be no doubt?"

"I knew you would say so, Amy; but you must think it over calmly. You know upon the subject of property, as well as of other things, we have no mine and thine; as we have one interest and duty, so we have equal rights. I cannot take this step without your full approbation and consent."

"Is that all that has troubled you for these few days past?" said Amy, as she looked into her husband's face, with an expression of joyful relief.

"All," said Edward.

"And why not speak to me at first about it? Why not let me share every trouble as it rises?"

"O, Amy, I felt it only on your account. I hated to deprive you of all these luxuries. You know with what delight I see you doing good, real good, with money."

"Never again, Edward, do me the injustice to suppose that I prefer the lower virtue of charity to the higher one of justice."—pp. 150—155.

II. Publications of the Sunday School Association—1. First, Second, and Third Books, for Sunday Schools.—2. The Sunday School Hymn Book.

We are indebted for these useful little books to a very excellent Association, whose existence and labours are too little known. It is a Sunday School Association, extending, so far as appears from the reports, only to Unitarians, aiming to combine their efforts, and whilst it obtains accurate knowledge of the state of Sunday School education in London and in the country, to aid one another by advice, co-operation, participation of books, and the fruits of experience. We refer with particular pleasure to the Sunday School Hymn Book, which is a bound book containing two hundred hymns for the wonderfully small price of eightpence. An extract from its very judicious preface will show that it has been compiled in the true spirit.

"A portion of them are certainly beyond the reach of the minds of mere children; but it was thought desirable to insert some which might help to carry on religious education beyond the age of childhood,—some which might cause the imagination to try its opening powers in elevated contemplations; for the compilers are convinced, that to bind down the youthful mind to the consideration of that only which is within its grasp, is to cripple its energies, to endanger its adopting a material scepticism, to prevent those sacred soarings, in which the religious life, as distinguished from the moral, mainly consists. There is in children under favourable circumstances, a dim apprehension of the high things of the Spirit, which gradually clears as the intellect expands; until, in ripened years, it ends in a noble conception of the Infinite God, and an assured faith in his Eternal Attributes and Government.

"The volume contains no Hymns suited especially to Sunday School children, that no countenance might be given to class religion. Such Hymns have rather been chosen as are suited to children as children, without reference to any peculiar station which they hold in society, or to any peculiar measures taken for their education. It is a high and important object to exalt a child's mind by making him feel that he is one of the human race, cared for by the God and Father of all—an irreligious act to call forth any mean subserviency, any hypocritical pretensions to gratitude, any feeling of being an alms-child, by the very instruction which is professedly intended to call forth his mental, moral, and religious faculties. Gratitude, reverence, veneration, are the spontaneous produce of the bosom, the involuntary response to disinterested deeds of sympathy and kindness: and the nearer, or the more delicate, our relation to our fellow-creatures, the more carefully must we abstain from making any direct demands for the exhibition of those affections, from endeavouring to call them forth by artificial stimulus."

We select as a specimen, an old favourite:

1.

" Go when the morning shineth,
Go when the moon* is bright,
Go when the eve declineth,
Go in the hush of night;
Go with pure mind and feeling,
Fling earthly thought away,
And in thy chamber kneeling,
Do thou in secret pray.

2.

" Remember all who love thee,
All who are lov'd by thee,
Pray, too, for those who hate thee,
If any such there be;
Then for thyself in meekness,
A blessing humbly claim,
And link with each petition
Thy great Redeemer's name.

3.

" Or if 'tis e'er denied thee
In solitude to pray,
Should holy thoughts come o'er thee
When friends are round thy way,
E'en then the silent breathings,
Thy spirit raised above,
Will reach his throne of glory
Who is mercy, truth, and love.

4.

" Oh! not a joy or blessing
With this can we compare,
The power that he hath given us
To pour our souls in prayer!
Whene'er thou pin'st in sadness,
Before his footstool fall,
Remember, in thy gladness,
His love who gave thee all."

---

* We are sorry to see the idea of the stanza, namely, of a religious feeling distributed through every portion of the day, broken by the substitution of "Moon" for "Noon."

III. National Establishments of Religion, Considered in Connexion with Justice, Christianity, and Human Nature. By John Taylor. London: Smallfield and Son. 1839.

We can only recommend to the perusal it deserves, this sensible and able essay. It is not remarkable, perhaps, for either style or matter, but full of good sense, well conceived and forcibly expressed. It obtained one of the prizes offered by the Committee of the Protestant Society for the Protection of Religious Liberty for the two best Essays on National Religious Establishments in reply to the Lectures delivered in London by Dr. Chalmers. Dr. Chalmers has performed for the voluntary principle, the undesigned service of stimulating the zeal of its defenders, and calling out some very able expositions of its practical importance. We need only cite the Treatise before us, and the very powerful work of Professor Vaughan, "The State of Religious Parties in England."

Mr. Taylor's Essay contains a discussion of the following points: whether the idea of civil government involves a Right to legislate upon Matters of Religion; whether civil interference with Religion is sanctioned or permitted by Christianity; the Idea of an Established Church; the tendency of Ecclesiastical Establishments; the actual operation of religious Establishments; the Supposed Efficacy of the Territorial Distribution of an Establishment; and the Voluntary Principle and its Results.

Could the evil of Establishments be more graphically depicted than by the following portions of an address of the Roman Catholics presented to George II.? or can any thing be more wicked than the spirit in which that people have been treated, and the seeds of bitter and enduring animosities sown in their hearts, and now again by the bigots of an Establishment sedulously re-sown, lest the crop of deadly passions, and fanatical hatreds, which are always the interests of superstition and a priesthood, should fail?

> "We are, may it please your Majesty, a numerous and very industrious part of your Majesty's subjects; and yet, by no industry, by no honest endeavours, is it in our power to acquire, or to hold, almost any secure or permanent property whatever.
>
> "By the laws now in force in this kingdom, a son, however undutiful and profligate, shall, merely by the merit of conforming to the Established Religion, not only deprive the Roman Catholic father of that free and full possession of his estate, that power to mortgage or other-

> wise dispose of it as the exigencies of his affairs may require, but shall himself have full liberty immediately to mortgage, or otherwise alienate the reversion of that estate from his family for ever—a regulation by which a father, contrary to the order of nature, is put under the power of his son, and through which, an early dissoluteness it not only suffered, but encouraged, by giving a pernicious privilege, the frequent use of which has broken the hearts of many deserving parents, and entailed poverty and despair on some of the most ancient and opulent families in this kingdom.
>
> "What we have concealed under a respectful silence, would form a far longer, and full as melancholy a recital. We speak with reluctance, though we feel with anguish."—p. 168.

This is the way the State, whose sole business should be to afford protection and equal rights to all peaceful subjects, has treated a people living in its bosom, doing its utmost to make them enemies to the government that denied them the rights of men. The history of Ireland has a still fuller and sadder account of injuries and iniquities to report.

IV. Inaugural Addresses by Lords Rectors of Glasgow University.

This is a splendid volume. We mean, that while lying on our table it attracts our complacent notice by its handsome octavo size; its classic calf-skin binding; its ample page and large clear type, its numerous engravings, not only of armorial bearings, but of many better known and better remembered objects—the old façade of the College Buildings—the Inner Court, the outer Court, the Court of the Professors, the Hunterian Museum, the Common Hall, and the Blackstone Chair. Such are the well-executed illustrations of a detailed history of the origin, laws, customs, and studies of the University, which very appropriately precedes the main ingredient of the work, the Rectors' Speeches. Until 1820, the Lord Rector seems to have usually accepted his office and taken oaths almost *sub silentio*. But in that year, Francis Jeffrey being elected to the chair, the warm feelings natural to one thus returning to "the early nurse of his studies" would not be content with a formal expression of acknowledgment. Each succeeding Rector has regarded himself as called upon to comply with this precedent, and thus we have the speeches which form the volume before us. They are, as might be expected, of unequal merit; some of them turning entirely, and most of them partly, on the common places suggested by the time and the occasion. The factitious interest which has recently attached to this office from political considerations (parties speaking of the election to it as a trumpery right exercised by a set of school-boys, or as a deliberate expression of opinion on the part of the youth of the west of Scotland, accordingly as the mode of filling up the vacancy thwarted or gratified their political bias)—this factitious interest, added to the natural desire of giving publicity to the peculiarities and claims of this ancient seat of learning, and of preserving productions, many of which are well worth preservation, have formed, we suppose, the motives for this publication. It is at once impressive and touching to read the addresses of men returning, after years of toil and conflict with the world, "to those scenes of guiltless ambition and youthful delight, when every thing around and before them was bright with novelty and hope," ere, as Brougham so happily expresses it, the young minds which they were addressing "had been plunged into those waters of bitterness, or cast an eye of regret, as now I do, upon the peaceful regions they had quitted for ever."

The addresses are very distinct in character. Jeffrey's and Campbell's affectionate and feeling—expressing the emotions of old students returned with life's honours thick upon them to their mother's embrace. One of Campbell's, however, has an independent merit and is well worth any one's perusal. Sir James Mackintosh's address is like himself, strong, sensible, and philosophical. Brougham's so excellent, as to have been very extensively read and known before this Publication. The Marquis of Lansdowne's quiet and gentlemanly. Cockburn's filled with a fine high moral tone that is most impressive. Lord Stanley endeavours rather stiffly to follow in the same path. Sir Robert Peel crowns the list, with that clever, not uninteresting, shrewd worldly speech of his, that occupied some space in the newspapers a couple of years ago. It pains us to observe the altered tone of the Rectors on some points. There are Sir James Mackintosh and Lord Jeffrey talking twenty years ago of the University, as a University, a place of instruction for the people of these islands, open to all alike—to the Dissenter and Episcopalian, the Catholic and the Jew; and then there are Sir Robert Peel and Lord Stanley, trying to infuse the narrower spirit, which, thank heaven, the constitution of the college will not allow to be realized in the form of exclusive laws, and talking of the scrupulous fidelity with which the relation should be maintained between the Universities and the Established Church of Scotland—of "disarming our enemies of their power, and gratifying the real friends of our Establishments." These were new sounds in Lord Rectors' speeches, and savoured of the Cam and Isis more than of the Clyde and Forth. The latter have always had broader mouths than the former, though Englishmen from the south of the Tweed forget it, in their associations with the more classic and *recherchès* streams.

There is much that is good and valuable, however, in all the speeches, and we suppose that every *alumnus* at least of the University will allow himself the gratification of possessing a copy of them. The number of students seems to average at upwards of a thousand.

V. "The Fear o' the Folk." By Philip Harwood. Bridport.

Here is a free-spoken sermon, certainly not written in any "fear of the folk." There are evidences of a young mind's fervour and fearlessness in it, at the same time that it is free from the vice of rashness. The author only forces on an acknowledged principle its own application.

We see in it indeed signs of that generous impetuosity, which, not content with having a bold object constantly before it, and with resolutely pursuing that object, will likewise insist on a peculiar mode of prosecuting it, and is impatient of the slower processes by which other minds may be arriving at the same result. But if there be such impetuosity we by no means reprehend it,—we should rather reprehend the absence of it. We know that a generous love of truth may possess, conjoined with itself, an increasing power of discerning and hailing the various *modes* in which Truth advances: but that a fear of fetterless inquiry, and a sceptical mistrust of Truth, form the sorriest portion with which a young mind can commence the journey of Thought. With regard to the more immediate argument of the sermon, we most heartily coincide with it, and we rejoice with joy unspeakable as we contemplate the open, manly, unbending course which its spirited author appears to be marking out for himself. We recommend this sermon to the attention of our readers; while the better to give an idea of its merits, we present them with the following extracts from it.

> "There is a timidity which is not exactly selfish or worldly, for it springs from a quite sincere, though mistaken, attachment to great social and spiritual interests, but which, almost equally with the other, tempts men aside from simplicity and godly sincerity. I mean the timidity which is *sceptical of truth*; which either dreads the practical working

of truth, or doubts the efficacy of discussion to discover and advance truth; and which fears above all things, giving offence to those to whom truth may be novel or disagreeable. I mean the timidity, for instance (to take my illustration from our own religious body), which fears that *the Unitarian cause may be injured* by Unitarian ministers speaking out what they think upon subjects that they have thought upon, and therefore have some sort of right to speak upon: I mean the timidity which would rather that such and such a particular truth were suppressed and let alone, than that a casual Trinitarian auditor should go home shocked; and which is comforted and overjoyed, when some convenient ambiguity of the orthodox vocabulary is dexterously foisted into the prayer or the sermon, because the Calvinists will then see that we honour Christ almost as highly as themselves."—pp. 8, 9.

This is taken from the life. The next is taken from the heart.

"Talk of truth doing harm to the Unitarian cause! Talk of the cause being injured by Unitarian ministers freely speaking what they have freely thought! Why, this *is* the cause:—Truth, Freedom, Honesty, Progression. This is the cause, at least I hope that it is: I should be sorry if it were not. If this were not the Unitarian cause, I should be sorry to call myself a Unitarian: I should be sorry to be associated with Unitarians; I should be sorry—I should be actually ashamed—to bear the office of a Unitarian minister. If I felt that in being a Unitarian minister I was other than a minister of truth, if I felt that my Unitarianism pledged me to keep back a particle of what I believe to be truth—of what to me *is* truth—that it pledged me *not* to declare to my fellow Christians that 'whole counsel of God,' which to every man, is that which he believes to be the truth, and the whole truth,—I confess that I should lose all my interest in my profession, I should lose all my interest in Unitarianism; I should feel that the Unitarian cause was a bad cause, an unchristian cause; I should ask with indignation and sorrow, what is this Unitarianism, to which I am to sacrifice and sell my common human birthright? and I should seriously set myself to find some new theological connection, where I could enjoy the reality of that freedom of which such a Unitarianism would have only the semblance and pretence."—pp. 28, 29.

INTELLIGENCE.

THE FIFTH REPORT OF THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL ASSOCIATION.—1839.

The Committee of the Sunday-School Association, in resigning the trust which was committed to them at the last Annual Meeting, beg to offer a brief account of their proceedings. They rejoice to think that the Institution has not declined either in usefulness or in importance during their period of office. The accounts will show that the state of the finances and property is more favourable than in any preceding year.

The first subject which occupied the attention of the Committee, was the necessity for shortly publishing a new edition of the "*First Book for Sunday-Schools*;" and although there was still a small remainder on hand, it was thought better to print a second edition immediately than incur the risk of injuring the sale of the work by allowing it to go out of print. Relying on the support of the schools connected with the Association, and looking to the approbation which has been so generally bestowed on the little work in question, they decided on printing the large number of 5000; by doing which they are enabled to offer it to the public at 8*s*. per 100, or to schools and subscribers, 6*s*. per 100.

Retaining the opinion expressed in a former Report as to the usefulness of the Lectures on subjects connected with Sunday-School education, the Committee arranged a third course, which was delivered in Carter-Lane Chapel in the early part of the present year. The attendance was better than on former occasions. They have much gratification in announcing that some of the Lectures delivered at their instance by the Rev. E. Chapman have lately been published, and will form a valuable addition to the catalogue of the Association.

The want of a Sunday-School Hymn-book has been long felt and frequently expressed. From time to time the matter has been brought before the Committee, and as often suffered to drop, because the funds of the Association would not admit of so heavy an undertaking being entered upon. At length, however, it was again pressed upon the attention of the Committee. A sub-committee was appointed to proceed with the selection of suitable Hymns, and application was directed to be made to the conductors of schools in connection with the Association, to ascertain what extent of support might safely be expected. The replies to these applications were on the whole favourable, about 450 copies being subscribed for. Estimates were then obtained, from which it appeared that an edition of 3000 copies could be carried though the press for about £30. After some consideration, the undertaking was decided upon. Many delays and difficulties have intervened; but in the course of one month from the present time, they trust the "Sunday-school Hymn-book" will be in the hands of subscribers. They hope they may be allowed to urge upon the friends of the Association the necessity of exertion to induce the conductors of schools to introduce the new Hymn-book, as the amount of money expended in its production is larger than has ever before been invested in any one undertaking, and will require a corresponding sale to secure a satisfactory return for the outlay. They would take this opportunity of replying to the numerous inquiries which have been made of the Agent, by expressing their regret at the many delays which have occurred, and by stating that they have every reason to believe the work will be ready for publication in the time above mentioned.

In the last Report, allusion was made to a letter which had been received from the Rev. Mr. Murch, on the subject of a manual of the Life of Christ. In that letter Mr. Murch requested to be excused from his promised task. Under these circumstances, your Committee had reason to fear they should be compelled to relinquish the contemplated publication, having made repeated unsuccessful applications to Miss Emily Taylor and others whom they considered likely to assist them; they have now, however, the pleasure to announce that the Rev. E. Chapman has kindly removed the difficulty, and has undertaken to prepare such a manual as was required. The Committee are sure that in his hands the important subject will lose none of its interest or importance.

UNITARIANISM IN EDINBURGH.*

Edinburgh, Sept. 5, 1839.

Sir,—I have this day received a copy of a Protest by certain persons assembling for Unitarian worship in Clyde-Street Hall, Edinburgh, and designating themselves " Ex-members and Seat-holders of the congregation of St. Mark's." I find that this Protest has already been transferred to your pages, though it only reached the Secretary of the parties protested against on the 27th of August, when it must have been in your publishers' hands. I ask your permission to notice it, not as the representative of the congregation of St. Mark's, but as an individual member of that congregation, deeply interested in its welfare, and longer connected with it than any of those who have recently left it, and protested against its proceedings.

I have no desire to find fault with the seceders, for the act of forming a separate establishment. They are the best judges whether our constitution is or is not consistent with the species of progression which they contemplate. My sole wish is to supply certain explanations and corrections which are necessary to prevent any misapprehension of facts or arguments calculated to injure the cause of our congregation, on the part of the readers of your work.

I beg to refer your readers to a communication on the constitution of the congregation, which appeared in your pages in May 1836. [C. R. III. 328.] All societies of men must have some professed object for which they exist. The object of a religious debating society being merely dialectical, they may cohere sufficiently without making the ex-

---

[*] As the Protest against Subscription appeared in our pages, we feel obliged to insert, as requested, this correspondence.

istence of a God, or any other principle, a professed basis of their union; but a *worshipping* society must know whom they worship, or they cannot unite; and a society for imparting religious instruction must be agreed as to whether the divine origin of Christianity, as founded on the history, and especially on the death and resurrection of Christ, is to be admitted or rejected as the basis of the instructions to be communicated from a place in which, by the nature of the case, debate is out of the question. Accordingly, the exclusive worship of the Father, and the acknowledgment of Christianity as a religion sent from God, have always been fundamental principles of our religious establishment. We admit no one to a deliberate voice in our affairs who is unwilling to express, in the most unequivocal terms, (though not by subscription, if he dislike it,) his acquiescence in these principles *at the period of his admission as a member*; but we concede to him when admitted, and claim for our society at large, the important right of reviewing the terms of our ecclesiastical constitution. We can therefore accommodate that constitution to any new convictions which we may, as a body, deliberately form,—guarding our fundamental laws, however, as other societies guard theirs, against the sudden and hasty decisions of small and possibly packed meetings, by the necessity of having much more than a mere majority of any given meeting to effect the alteration. This constitution, we are told, is "hostile to those principles of freedom and progression which our preachers and writers are daily proclaiming to the world as the boast and glory of the Unitarian denomination." I see nothing in our constitution which merits this reprehension. It does not hinder progression when it is the result of conviction in minds which, originally at one with us in our avowed principles, have by reflection altered and modified their views; but it *does* hinder that progression which is the result of flooding us from without with persons totally *opposed* to these principles—a process of conversion or progression which I do not particularly admire, and which might be very easily effected by a popular declaimer, provided that "the simple fact of a fellow-creature being willing," as the protesters express themselves, "to unite habitually with us for worship and instruction," were recognized by us as "a sufficient basis," not merely "for religious communion,"—*that* is a thing we freely allow to all—but for conferring the right of filling our pulpit, regulating our affairs, and determining whether our "progression" is to be within the pale of Christianity or without it—towards Trinitarianism or Unitarianism—towards darkness or light.

But we are told that the "principles of spiritual liberty and progression," on which the protesters have founded their church, are those "in conformity with which most Unitarian congregations in Great Britain are," as the protesters believe, "actually constituted." You, Sir, and our English friends generally, are the best judges of this matter. I *have* been given to understand that many of your chapels are under old trusts, defining very precisely (it may be in some instances too precisely) the purposes to which they are to be applied. I *have* heard that you call yourselves "Christians" and "Unitarians," and I *have* supposed that these terms with you are not mere sounds, but that they have a precise meaning; which meaning, whatever it is, you would not object to explain. I have therefore always been disposed to think that you really have, not merely as individuals, but as churches, a belief; and that as the word creed means belief, that you actually have *a creed*; a creed not made for the purpose of controlling your "spiritual liberty and progression," but admitting of being accommodated, like ours, to the increasing light of your religious societies—a creed not embracing, like the common creeds, all the points on which honest men have ever debated, so many in number, that no men really honest can, even for one moment, agree in all of them—but limited, like ours, to those points on which union is essential to your very existence as societies for religious worship and religious instruction. I am quite aware of the just repugnance of the old English Presbyterians to the use of tests; I am aware that their dislike went so far as to induce them to refrain from the expression (in their collective capacity as churches) of opinions which they really and universally entertained—though *never* so far as to exclude all expressions of opinion—*never* so far as to exclude the assertion of the Divine existence and the truth of Christianity as a bond of union—*never*, therefore, so far as to leave them absolutely without a creed.* To take away all expression of principle, and to substitute *willingness to unite*, as the basis of religious co-operation, is a modern invention—if indeed it be anything more than a theoretical speculation, which, when fully and fairly tried, will fail in its professed object.

But I shall suppose that I am wrong in all this, and that "most of the Unitarian congregations in Great Britain" are really constituted like that of Clyde-Street Hall. Even in this case I do not see how creeds are got rid of: for although they do not call themselves by the name of Christians, they do say that they are a "Unitarian Church," and they do say that their hall was opened "for Unitarian *worship*." If, therefore, these words, deliberately selected by them as expository of the nature and object of a new institution in this place, are not "utterly indefinite" and of "no value whatever," they must mean something, and that *something*, whatever it be, is as much a creed as the creed of St. Mark's. The society is committed to the obnoxious principle "of creed-making," though not of test-making; for the word test is commonly employed to denote an instrument for depriving a recusant of privileges he has acquired or has a right to—not a mere spontaneous profession of the belief he entertains at a given moment of his life; and from tests thus defined they and we are equally free. But though both they and we admit creeds and reject tests, there is nevertheless a great difference between us, which I desire not to gloss over or to conceal; and if "most of the Unitarians in Great Britain" do really adopt their view in preference to ours, I will tell them plainly why it is that I think that view exceedingly wrong. The question whether there is or is not such a thing as a revelation of the will of God to his human offspring, other than that which the book of nature contains, is in my view a vital one to every society whose professed object is, "religious worship and theological and moral instruction." It appears to me that there is a difference of opinion between the societies of St. Mark's and Clyde-Street Hall as to the position which such a revelation, if true, is entitled to hold. *Some* of the members of the latter say they "could still assent to" the creed of the former "as a correct statement of their individual opinions;" and they must therefore believe in "the divine mission of our blessed Saviour, as evidenced by his life, death, and resurrection, recorded in the New Testament." Yet they adopt a designation which, while it involves, as we have seen, the admission of a creed, excludes from that creed all acknowledgment of Christ as a teacher sent from God. And this omission is not casual, but intentional; for they not only object to our employment of the terms above quoted as expressive of our religious belief, but to the substitution of any other words of similar import for them. The plain effect of this is, that Christianity cannot assume a higher position in their pulpit than that of a matter of speculation—one of those subjects "respecting which," to use their own words, "the wisest and best of men have doubted or differed: it cannot be in their pulpit, as it is in ours, the authoritative basis of the instructions thence delivered. To surrender this important advantage for the sake of conciliating those who are in principle opposed to Christianity or doubtful of its sanctions, and who therefore very honourably refuse formally to acknowledge its paramount claims, seems to me to be the very insanity of liberality. Would any man imagine that the founders of an astronomical professorship infringed the freedom of *science* by assuming that the stars have a real existence? If not, then the founders of St. Mark's have not infringed *religious* freedom by assuming that Christianity is a glorious reality, and by making this stone, thus unworthily treated by a *very few* of the builders of their *material* place of worship, the head corner-stone of their *moral* and *religious* edifice. I am happy to observe that the said builders do not allege that Christianity ever held a less prominent position with the society now assembling at St. Mark's, or insinuate that they have been duped by any false pretences on the part of their late associates; but, on the contrary, inform us that "recent circumstances" have given them a new view of the importance of protesting against an ecclesiastical constitution in which some of them had once formally and deliberately acquiesced. I can only say, in reply, that the necessity of some such constitution to "the peace of churches" and to the glory of Christianity, (so far as its glory can be comprised by the acts of churches,) and the perfect consistency of such a constitution with "the freedom of mind," are, as I think, strongly illustrated by all "the recent circumstances in the history of St. Mark's. Whensoever we are satisfied by good and sufficient reasons, either that Christianity is not true, or that it is not deserving of the prominent position which we have hitherto assigned to it, or that something else is better and of higher authority, we have full power to give effect to our new convictions, unimpeded by trust-deeds or by Acts of Parliament. Till we receive some such illumination, no one can justly reproach us for continuing to act upon our present avowed principles. But what is the case with the protesters, and what would have been the case with us if we had followed their guidance? As they require nothing to constitute membership but habitual *union* with them for "worship and instruction" in Clyde-Street Hall, I can see no reason why deniers of the truth of Christianity should not soon become the predominant party among them, nor why a few accessions from among the disciples of Mr. Owen should not outvote those among them who tell us that they "could still assent" to our avowed belief, nor why their pulpit should not thus become an instrument for inculcating the belief that Christianity is a delusion, and that the resurrection of Christ and the solemn hopes of a future life founded upon it, are a fraud practised on the credulity of mankind. I would not be understood to say that the protesters actually contemplate this conclusion, but I do say that it is a conclusion against which they have provided no protection, and which seems to me not at all unlikely to happen. Let a popular declaimer, calling himself (if you will) a Unitarian, only find his way to their pulpit for one or two Sundays, and it will be easy to find recruits enough to carry "progression" in any direction he may think best. A little activity in beating up for such recruits, with a few harangues of little depth, and much plausibility, will enable any party to vanquish by *pressure from without*, the very best arguments and the fruit of the most anxious and most elaborate inquiries.

---

* It is very probable that a system such as that of St. Mark's would have saved some of these chapels and other trusts from being now in the hands of the lawyers.

I have been led into this long statement, not by the importance of the secession to the interests of St. Mark's, but by the importance which I attach to the reputation of our religious body among their friends elsewhere. As the co-operation of the protesters would be dearly purchased by acceding to their views as explained by themselves, it is some comfort to be able to assure you that your alarms for the consequences to the Unitarian cause at Edinburgh are altogether unnecessary. Mr. Maclellan is highly popular and acceptable, and preaches to larger congregations than have been usual at this season of the year; and there have been several very valuable accessions to the number of seat-holders since the meeting of the 30th July. I hope I may add without offence to any, that the printed Protest may easily give you a higher notion of the amount of our loss than the facts really warrant. It is introduced with a statement that the assemblage on the 11th August amounted to nearly sixty, who were principally ex-members and seat-holders of the congregation of St. Mark's. The copy handed to our Secretary, sixteen days after that date, is signed by thirty persons,* and the amount of the claims of these parties to be considered as founders and supporters of our congregation is thus analysed by that gentleman.

First, as to their pretensions to the character of founders, he observes as follows:

1. The first pastor of our Church, then entirely Arian and Universalist, was appointed 63 years ago.

---

* Many of them young men, necessarily but imperfectly informed on the subject, and who, it may be hoped, will upon more mature reflection see cause to change their views.

2. None of the protesters were subscribers to the Young-Street chapel, or in any way connected with the congregation at the opening of that chapel in 1823.

3. Three of them were subscribers to the fund for building St. Mark's.

4. Nine of them took seats in St. Mark's chapel when it was opened in 1835.

Secondly, as to their pretensions to the character of steady supporters of the congregation, the Secretary gives the following facts:—

The seats are let half-yearly, in May and November, and the largest number of protesters appearing on the roll of seat-holders at any one term is sixteen.

Fourteen of them are at present in arrear of their seat-rents.

Two do not appear on the roll at all; or, in other words, had never had seats.

Five appear once, or took seats in May last.

Seven appear twice, or were first seat-holders in November 1838.

One appears three times.

Two appear four times.

Three appear five times.

Seven appear six times.

None appear seven times, except

Three, who appear at all the eight terms.

I need not add that if any inaccuracy in these facts can be proved, the Secretary will be most ready to correct it.

J. G.

Edinburgh, Oct. 12, 1839.

Sir,—I observe in the Reformer for October, (p. 764) a communication from a member of the St. Mark's Congregation, containing strictures on the principles that have governed the recent seceders from that society, upon which you will, I hope, consider it but just to allow one of those seceders to make a few remarks.

In assimilating to the verbal test-symbol of St. Mark's that practical matter-of-fact community of feeling and opinion which undoubtedly does prevail to a large extent in English Unitarian Churches, and giving the name of *creed* to the latter, your correspondent confounds things which essentially differ—which make *all* the difference between the churches of Clyde-Street Hall and St. Mark's. If that general similarity of opinion and congeniality of sentiment which enable a number of individuals to join in the same worship, and receive instruction from the same minister, are, as your correspondent contends, to be called a "creed," so be it; it is a mere question of nomenclature; but let some other name be found for those verbal symbols of belief, authoritatively imposed as conditions of religious co-operation, and guarded by special Church-laws, which the rest of mankind are wont to designate by this epithet. The difference between these two things is the difference between Clyde-Street Hall and St. Mark's. It is also, I believe, the difference between the generality of English Unitarian Churches and St. Mark's. *Is* the "willingness to unite," as constituting the basis of religious co-operation, a "modern invention?" Is it not, Mr. Editor, in point of fact, the only basis of English Unitarian Church-membership; and would not the attempt to substitute for this the "modern invention,"—modern, i. e. for Unitarians,—of an "expression of principle," by which is meant a formal assent to a verbal symbol, legally guarded and authoritatively imposed, be very generally repudiated by the Unitarian Churches of your country?

As a member of the Clyde-Street Hall congregation, I am not aware of any inconsistency between the principles of the Protest and the adoption of the title "Unitarian Church," or avowal of the object, "Unitarian worship." We use the term to indicate a fact, not to enact a law; to express in a brief and intelligible way the present opinions and objects of that majority by which our congregational affairs are at present regulated; not to create a test binding on the future, still less a test which may empower a future minority exceeding one-fifth, to outvote a future majority not amounting to four-fifths. We *are* Unitarians, we *do* meet for Unitarian worship, and we adopt the name which most conveniently expresses those very simple matters of fact.* That is all. Your correspondent, J. G., appears to think that there can be no such thing as definiteness of conviction on the part of the members of a religious society, except in conjunction with, and guarded by a formal symbol of, Church union, losing sight of the great truth, that the objects of religion and of Christianity being moral and spiritual, not dogmatico-theological, all that is necessary, all that is even desirable, as a bond of Church-union, is a matter-of-fact community of object and fellowship of feeling, which community and fellowship are best evidenced by the "willingness to unite." If any human being is willing to associate himself habitually with others, in offering the same worship, and receiving the same instruction, in serving God and Truth, there is a simple and staple basis of union for all the purposes and results contemplated by Christianity.

I am at a loss to understand your correspondent's meaning in the sentence, "The plain effect of this is, that Christianity cannot assume a higher position in their pulpit than that of a matter of speculation—one of those subjects 'respecting which,' to use their own words, 'the wisest and best of men have doubted or differed;' it cannot be in their pulpit, as it is in ours, the authoritative basis of the instructions thence delivered." What is implied by this antithesis of "speculation" to "authoritative basis?" *Can* Christianity—can *any* thing that human beings believe—be more than a matter of speculation, i. e. of opinion, which may rise to the stability of conviction and practical moral certainty, and so possess, *to the believing mind*, the authority of truth, but can have no other authority than that of its own individually felt and appreciated evidence? The founder of the "astronomical professorship," assumes, of course, that the stars have a real existence, and that important truths relative to the facts and laws of their movements, are discoverable by man, and he institutes his professorship for their discovery and exposition. We assume that *religion* has a real existence, subjectively and objectively, and that important truths and principles relative to it may be ascertained and made practically impressive, by meetings for worship and instruction, and we found our Church. Supposing that the astronomical founder should go one step further, and make subscription to Newton's Principia binding either on the professor or his pupils, he could hardly escape ridicule and censure, even by pleading the *demonstrative certainty* of mathematical science. A parallel proceeding by a founder of a *Moral* Philosophy professorship, imposing subscription to the systems of Brown or Stewart, would be felt to be preposterous.

---

* The fundamental resolution passed at the first meeting of our society, is—"That this Congregation do constitute an association for worship and instruction, on the principles of a Rational Theology and a Spiritual Religion."

Your correspondent says, in strange contrast with the boast of the "authoritative basis," "Whensoever we are satisfied, by good and sufficient reasons, either that Christianity is not true, or that it is not deserving of the prominent position which we have hitherto assigned to it, or that something else is better and of higher authority, we have full power to give effect to our new convictions, unimpeded by trust-deeds or by Acts of Parliament." I presume, from the tone of this statement, he considers the possession of this power a right and desirable thing. So do we: and we separate from St. Mark's precisely because the St. Mark's congregation does not possess it, i. e., the *majority* does not possess it. Suppose that congregation to consist at any future time of one hundred members, and of these one hundred, seventy-nine to be "satisfied by good and sufficient reasons," &c., they have no power whatever to give effect to their new convictions. If it be simply desired to guard against "the sudden and hasty decision of small and possibly packed meetings," the object might be attained, we conceive, by judicious regulations as to the mode of summoning general congregational meetings, without thus infringing on the rights of a real and fair majority. But surely no one can fail to perceive the palpable inconsistency of the St. Mark's constitution, as stated by J. G., requiring, as that constitution does, conformity to the creed *at the period of a man's admission as a member*, on the ground that such conformity is essential to religious co-operation,—yet "conceding to him, when admitted, the important right of reviewing the terms of our ecclesiastical constitution;" in other words, making *that* an essential *pre-requisite* to the privileges of membership, the *continuance* of which is not essential to their *continued enjoyment*. Is theological conformity, or is it not, indispensable to religious fellowship and co-operation? If it *be*, why continue the latter after the former has ceased? If it be *not*, why make the exaction at all? Your correspondent states in one place, that the creed of St. Mark's is "limited to those points on which union is essential," and *yet* that this same creed "does not hinder progression when it is the result of conviction in minds which originally at one with us in our avowed principles, have by reflection altered and modified their views,"—and that "we concede the important right of reviewing the terms of our ecclesiastical constitution:" so that the creed, limited to points essential to the very existence of a religious society, may be reviewed, altered, relinquished, point by point, without a forfeiture of membership.

I am surprised that your correspondent, with a faith in Christianity that is not speculative merely, but authoritative, can "see no reason why deniers of the truth of Christianity should not soon become the predominant party" in the Clyde-Street Hall congregation. There is only this reason—that Christianity being, as I, individually, earnestly, and solemnly believe, *true* and worthy of all acceptation, the average probabilities are, that inquiry will result in riveting the conviction of its truth, where that conviction exists, and producing it where it does not. I believe that our only real danger on this subject is the result of the way in which Christianity is regarded and treated by the ecclesiastical constitution of the society from which we have separated ourselves. Men will suspect truth, when, instead of being trusted to the lawful, natural guardianship of its own evidences, it is defended by artificial, exclusive Church laws, and raised from the region of speculation, into that of authority. Our pulpit will not "become an instrument for inculcating the belief that Christianity is a delusion, and that the resurrection of Christ and the solemn hopes of a future life founded upon it, are a fraud practised on the credulity of mankind," until the convictions of our congregation are such as to induce them to elect a minister who will so employ it. St. Mark's pulpit will be employed, we presume, in the same manner "whensoever" the St. Mark's congregation, that is, whensoever four-fifths of them "are satisfied, by good and sufficient reasons, either that Christianity is not true, or that it is not deserving of the prominent position hitherto assigned to it." The difference between us in this particular is, that we of Clyde Street Hall have a trust in the action of evidence on the minds of the majority for the time being; the want of which trust, they of St. Mark's supply by the law of the four-fifths. Meanwhile, if I may judge from the acceptance which services avowedly and earnestly Christian meet with, from week to week, in Clyde-Street Hall, our progress is not, in any degree, to the belief that Christianity is a delusion. If your correspondent, J. G., would "come and see," I think he might discover that there *are* reasons against the anticipated early predominance in our body of *such* deniers of the truth of Christianity.

That the chapels of the English Presbyterians, had they adopted such a constitution as that of St. Mark's, would not at this day have been in the hands of the lawyers, I frankly concede to J. G.; but I demand of him, *e contra,* on his own premises, to concede to me that neither would they have been in the hands of Unitarians. Had the English Presbyterians expressed as definitely as the congregation of St. Mark's their doctrinal tenets for the time being—embodied those in a test symbol, and guarded its permanence by a law requiring the concurrence of four-fifths of their members to its slightest alteration—the whole of their chapels would now be in the undisturbed possession of orthodox worshippers, for the very plain reason, that their congregations would never have burst the chains of such a creed. They have progressed to their present superior light, solely in consequence of their freedom from an ecclesiastical constitution, which might indeed have kept their chapels out of the hands of the lawyers, but which would have kept their minds and consciences in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity.

I think your correspondent will regret, upon more mature reflection, that he allowed himself to pen that sentence,—"Let a popular declaimer calling himself (if you will) a Unitarian, only find his way to their pulpit, for one or two Sundays, and it will be easy to find recruits enough to carry 'progression' in any direction he may think best. A little activity in beating up for such recruits, with a few harangues of little depth and much plausibility, will enable any party to vanquish, *by pressure from without*, the very best arguments, and the fruit of the most anxious and most elaborate inquiries." What right has J. G. to speak thus contemptuously of the understandings and moral convictions of men who, for anything that he knows, are as sound-hearted in the love and pursuit of truth as himself, and those with whom he worships? Is this the meekness of Christianity, or the arrogance of Orthodoxy? I hope it will be long before any member of the Clyde-Street Hall Church acquires a faith, whether speculative or authoritative, which can speak thus insultingly of the intellectual and religious character of opponents. I think he may regret, likewise, the tone of easy and somewhat contemptuous *nonchalance* in which he has permitted himself to speak of the opinions of "young men." These young men are perhaps not more "imperfectly informed" on the subjects connected with the recent secession, than on those involved in their former secession from Calvinism to the communion of St. Mark's; yet I do not remember that on *that* occasion they received any cautionary monition urging more mature reflection. But the cases are different. *Then* they submitted to an "authoritative" faith, and the requisite maturity of reflection was taken for granted.

So much for the principles of the case. I must now descend to review the labours of the Secretary of St. Mark's, and examine the *facts* which he has contributed to the demonstration. The charge of exaggeration of statement in respect to the number of adherents of the new Church, must disappear before the fact, of which the Secretary and your correspondent, J. G., might have made themselves cognizant, had they taken the trouble to inquire, that many who seceded from St. Mark's in consequence of the congregational vote in regard to the creed, did not, from various reasons, subscribe the Protest; some because, though approving the principles on which our society was based, and willing to co-operate for its furtherance, they yet felt disinclined to take the public pledge which their signature of the Protest would have implied to persevering efforts to rear a church in harmony with these principles; and others, because though connected with St. Mark's, and lending the congregation most valuable aid in the conducting of the musical department of the worship, yet, having sittings allotted to them in the organ-gallery, they were not enrolled in the ordinary list of seat-holders, and did not therefore consider themselves in strictness to fall under the category of subscribers of the document in question. That a copy of that document was in your publishers' hands, simultaneously with the principal reaching the Secretary of St. Mark's, may be a simple matter of fact, but constitutes no just ground of complaint against the protesters. Equally pointless is the indictment, to which they at once plead guilty, that they did not dispatch the Protest for sixteen days after the first meeting of the new Church for worship.

The protesters spoke of leaving the church which they had "*contributed* to found," as matter of fact, and not of boasting; and in doing so they had regard to the establishment of the society on its present (externally) stable and respectable footing in St. Mark's. To such as know the complete change in the prospects and character of the congregation which took place at that time and in consequence of that event, it will not appear unnatural that those who shared the exertions and sacrifices of that period,—who, by contributing to found the building, virtually contributed to re-found the society worshipping in it, should, perhaps inappropriately, have by implication applied to themselves, according to the proportion of their respective individual exertions, the epithet of "founders," objected to by your correspondent J. G. on the ground, *inter alia*, that the "first pastor of *our* church, then entirely Arian and Universalist, was appointed sixty-three years ago." The best proof of the entire change in the condition and constituency of the congregation between the periods of the building of Young-Street chapel and the building of St. Mark's is to be found in the fact, (I speak on the authority of documentary evidence in my possession,) that only nine individuals (three of them being brothers) connected with Edinburgh Unitarianism, who assisted in the erection of the first place of worship in 1823, assisted also in the erection of the second in 1835. By the statement, that "none of the protesters were subscribers to the Young-Street chapel," J. G. probably means subscribers *to the building* of that chapel, but certainly not one reader in a thousand would so understand him. The fact, however, is notorious, that some of the protesters were for many years amongst the most liberal contributors in the congregation to the support of the worship conducted in the Young-Street chapel, and leaders in the movement for the erection of St. Mark's.

But it seems the claim of the protesters to be considered even as *supporters* of the St. Mark's congregation is disputed, and in the endeavour to shake this claim, the Secretary has not scrupled to provide, nor J. G. to employ, weapons which he cannot turn against the protesters without at the same time inflicting a wound on some of the best existing supporters of St. Mark's, many of whom are *recent converts to Unitarianism*, and not a few were at the date of our secession, and, it would not surprise me to learn, are at present, "in arrear of their seat-rents."* The Secretary's *minor facts* I have no means of testing; but denying the inferences which he would draw from them, I might concede their general correctness, without fear of the principles of our secession being thereby affected. I cannot help remarking, however, and I do so with pain, that one or two of the *facts* adduced by the Secretary are, if not palpable misstatements, at least calculated to convey erroneous impressions to the public. I shall only instance that with which he concludes; it is, that " none" of the protesters " appear seven times," that is, were seat-holders at seven half-yearly terms, " except three who appear at all the eight terms" which have elapsed since the opening of St. Mark's. Now, whoever should draw from this the inference (and I see not well what other inference any person who has only the Secretary's facts before him could draw from it) that three only of the protesters have been regular and steady adherents of the St. Mark's congregation from the opening of the chapel down to the date of the secession, would be drawing an inference at variance with the real state of the case. But then the Secretary will reply, all above that number were " *in arrear of their seat-rents!*"

---

* Although the terms of Whit-Sunday and Martinmas are the requisite periods at which the seats in churches and chapels in Edinburgh are let and the rents payable, yet, from there being no competition for pews either in the Young-Street chapel or St. Mark's, it has not been customary for the seat-holders to be very punctual in regard to the time of their payments. This circumstance has enabled the Secretary to furnish J. G. with the above *materials of argument.*

In conclusion, permit me to state, as a member of the Clyde-Street Hall Congregation, what I regret the tone of J. G.'s letter renders it necessary that I should state, my conviction of the truth and worth of Christianity, and my belief that no religious society can prosper if it be not Christian,—Christian, that is, in *heart*, in *temper*, in *spirit*; a kind of Christianity which I can very well conceive to exist with more or less of speculative scepticism as to the miraculous parts of the Christian history. I am not at all apprehensive that any " pressure from without" will take *this* Christianity from us. The habitual " willingness to unite" will rarely exist except in connexion with something of that living reverence for God and Truth, which is the essence of Christianity. That this spirit may increasingly live in the hearts, and its fruits appear in the lives, of ourselves and of those from whom we have separated, is the earnest desire of

ROBERT NEIL.

EXTRACTS FROM THE THIRD REPORT ADDRESSED TO THE COMMITTEE OF THE LIVERPOOL DOMESTIC MISSION SOCIETY, BY THEIR MINISTER TO THE POOR.

The degree of success which I have obtained, has borne more immediately upon the original object of my ministry than might at first view be imagined. That object, you will remember, was the restoration of the Sabbath-breaking poor to their respective religious connections. I may confidently state my conviction, that this has followed, in many cases, as a natural and necessary result, from the steps which I have taken to ameliorate their worldly condition. I found that numbers were detained at home on the Sabbath, not by any disinclination to join in the services of religion, but by the want of clothes, &c., in which to appear respectably among their fellow-worshippers. These wants, upon such a scale, I had not the means to supply; and, looking beyond the present moment, I may add that I had not the wish to supply them. One resource was left—that of inducing them to supply these wants, or some part of them, for themselves. " On this hint I spoke," and on this principle I acted. As a visitor to the Provident Society, the means were at once in my power. In several instances I found that the pawnbroker—that universal Master of the Robes of nakedness—was in possession of what might remove every obstacle to their attendance, more or less regular, on the services of the Sabbath. Patiently collecting the sum, I saw it applied to its object, and set the prisoner free. In other cases, *new* clothes were wanted. I had rarely the power or the inclination to *give* them. But I could and did induce them to make me their banker for the value of them; and though *other* wants have often caused the diversion of the sum collected, to different uses, yet I have not unfrequently seen the attempt successful. From my own experience, I am convinced that it is in the power of the District Provident visitor greatly to alter the degree of attendance upon the churches and chapels in the vicinity. Great is the amount of what I should call *the sleeping power of good* in this town; and happy should I be to see some stronger symptoms of its awakening. * * *

I have also the gratification of being able to state, that, induced by my representations, many of the better class of tradesmen and workmen of my district have deposited various sums in the Savings Bank—many once, and a few several times. Every success of this sort has given me unalloyed satisfaction. I have seen many a worthy man (too often, I grieve to say, in the evening of his days) who has now what he never had before—a something, however little, to stand between him and the workhouse; or, in case of his decease, to enable his widow and family to meet the charge of his interment, and to begin the world anew without lying wholly at its mercy. I have seen so much of the misery arising from the death of the *bread-winner* of the family, when *nothing* has been laid by against possibilities which all should remember, that I have felt a more than common anxiety to transfer whatever I could from the Provident Society to the Savings Bank. It is not then so lightly withdrawn. The recall of it is a more formal, and must be a more considerate act; and in all these cases, I would, if it were possible, "make assurance doubly sure."

Leaving this subject, I have only to notice, in passing, that the same views and feelings, carried down to smaller sums and to younger and more irregular depositors, have induced me to open a juvenile savings bank, at which a premium is given to children of all ages upon the halfpence deposited (with the parents' knowledge) in my hands. The box and book are open twice in the week. Sixpence is the largest sum received within that time; but any smaller sum is received, even down to a farthing. At present, of course, this little affair is working upon a very limited scale. The depositors are chiefly the children who attend the school. Still, my object will have been gained, as far as the experiment has been tried, if in this, the very Temptation Desert of recklessness and improvidence, I have given these children some idea of thinking of the future, some early and pleasant associations with the right management of money, and some insight into the secret (so much undivulged, where its divulgement would most avail), that many small and unprofitable sums may, by accumulation, be productive of substantial benefit.

I have no wish to make them premature misers, or misers at all, but, where every thing is drawing them away in the *opposite* direction, I have a strong desire to counteract, as far as possible, the lurking but active principle of future misery and evil.

Many of you, my Christian friends, in passing and repassing to and from your various offices and homes, must have been struck, a thousand times, with the number and forlorn condition of those children, who go about the streets, early and late, selling herrings, chips, grit, apples, matches, &c. They can scarcely have been observed, without attracting repeated and compassionate attention to the distinctive marks of penury and distress, as exhibited in the expression of their features, in their persons, and in their attire. They all wear rags, the uniform of their calling. Many of them have not enough, even of these, for the purposes of decency; and comfort and health are, in their case, out of the question. But these poor little beings—many of whom must fall victims to the early hardships of their lot—are not to be pitied only on account of their physical and apparent privations. These are but the types and shadows of the destitution and neglectedness of all within. Occupied from morning to night in the pursuit of halfpence from street to street, and from district to district, they have no time for attending any of the schools which are open *at present* to the children of the poor. If they are ever taken from their employment, it must be in consequence of a temporary yielding to the most urgent remonstrances, or the most affectionate persuasions; for those employments are often so important to their idle or sickly parents, and sometimes so lucrative from the activity and adroitness of the young traders, that it is a work of the utmost difficulty to induce the parents to recall them, and suffer them to be put in the way of obtaining some education. And when this is done, there is always a strong likelihood that it may have been done in vain. Again and again, I have extorted the reluctant consent of the parent, dressed the child, and sent it to some neighbouring school;—but after a few weeks, or even days, the child's place in the school knows it no more; the clothes have vanished; the rags have re-appeared; and "the wandering voice" is again heard in the streets, proclaiming what is to be sold, and the unwearied importunity of the seller. Possibly some among you, on reading this account, may find that my experience is but a repetition of their own. Like me, they may have hoped for success, when the nearest to disappointment; and thrown away time and trouble in endeavouring to convince the parents of these young unfortunates, that good principles and good habits are acquisitions greatly to be preferred to any gains that can be purchased by their loss. * * * *

Compared with these, I am an unit among thousands. I saw what was wrong, but what could I do to set it right? I looked around me in vain for any institution, at which these neglected children might receive the benefit of a little regular instruction in the evening—for I knew that it was idle to think of any education for them *during the day*. All that I could do was to open an evening school for them at my own district-house (on alternate days of the week for the boys and girls respectively), and place them under the care of the person, whose assistance you have so kindly given me the means of obtaining, and whose regularity and attention have been of great value to me in this department. No efforts have, I believe, been wanting, to make the attendance upon these schools *regular*, but they have all failed, and I fear will always fail, of the success which I desire. Some of the male pupils are apprentices, whose work is often required, at busy periods, beyond the hours at which their attendance at the school would be practicable. Several of the girls are engaged in the sale of various articles upon the streets; and an hour or two of additional business is often a matter of too deep concernment to their families for any prospect of mental gain to be put in competition with it. Nevertheless the school-door has never been shut; and there has always been a sufficiency to form a school. The progress of the children, both in knowledge and in cleanliness, has been perceptible; the parents have repeatedly expressed themselves as pleased with what is done for them; and I hope that something *has* been done, to prepare them for the requisitions of life. A young person, who lives near, has given them instructions in sewing, in which several of them have made a very promising proficiency. Tickets are given them for different kinds of merit, of which three may be obtained every school evening, and thirty of which represent the value of sixpence. When a sufficient number of these tickets has been acquired, they have their choice of a variety of made-up articles of dress, according to the sum of money which their tickets represent; and thus many of them have already procured for themselves a timely supply of durable and suitable clothing. * *

The number of male pupils, who have received papers of admission, is 33. The number of girls is 43. *All* the nominal pupils, however, have never been at once in attendance. Some, too, have attended but once or twice at the utmost—a circumstance which will surprise none, who have mixed much with our poor, and know how hard it is to *keep them up* to any thing that is for their good. A judgment may be formed of the attendance from the following statement of the number present in each school on the four last evenings—the dates of which, it will be perceived, go somewhat beyond the formal term of the Report:—

Boys.		Girls.	
Oct. 10	12	Oct. 11	24
,, 15	12	,, 16	29
Nov. 14	26	Nov. 13	36
,, 19	26	,, 15	31

* * * * * *

In my wish to diffuse knowledge, I hope I need not say that I have not been forgetful of that knowledge which is the most important of all. For some time, I have had a regular Sunday evening service in my district-house, having obtained a proper license for that purpose. I have had many difficulties to overcome in the collection and formation of any thing like a congregation. Had I belonged to any denomination that is known, and has adherents among my people, the case would have been altered, and my task would have been comparatively easy. The lifting up of a new though humble standard, bearing the recognized blazonry of any familiar sect, whether Church, or Catholic, or Methodist, or any other, would have ensured me the attendance of several of those belonging to it, and who would have taken it for granted, that, while there might be some convenience in the place, and some novelty in the preaching, there could be no sort of heresy to be apprehended in the creed. But from the first I have been known to belong to none of them. No part of my conduct in the district could have marked me out for a partisan of any particular sect of Christianity. Mere sectarian opinions I have taken and left as I found them. I have been a preacher of Christianity in its most general, and, as it appears to me, in its most genuine form. I have attacked no creed in public or in private, and have endeavoured, whenever it was in my power, to do justice to the brighter and better parts of all. And in this I have not been acting a part, but simply following out the dictates of principle and of feeling. I have felt both pride and pleasure in the height and breadth of my ground. Mixing with all sects, I have learned something in turn from them all. The causes of any suspicion of my future attempts at proselytism are to be sought in others, for they cannot be found in me. There are those, however, who, judging from their own prejudices and practice, find it difficult to conceive of a course, which to them appears as unaccountable as it is unusual. Taking it for granted that mine must be the creed of some sect, they cannot believe but that I must be actuated by the desire of making converts to it. They have no conception of a Christian truth, which seeks no amalgamation with the opinions of a party. Fears, which if they knew me better, they would know to be unfounded, have kept away many, who, if relieved of them, would be glad to hear me, and some of them, I cannot but think, would be better and happier for doing so. They are content rather to pass many of the service hours of the Sunday at the doors of their houses, at the corners of the streets, or on the steps of the cellars, than to come where they have heard that there *may be* a design to sap or to storm the faith which they hold with their neighbours or from their fathers. * *

The attendance upon the Evening Service during the last month, has been as follows:—

Sept. 1	37	Sept. 15	46
,, 8	32	,, 22	33

On the Morning Service:—

Sept. 15	24	Sept. 22	29

I have very recently added a morning service to the evening.* This is, as yet, less numerously attended—partly, for the obvious reason, that it is more difficult for the servantless poor to leave their rooms and cellars at the former time than at the latter. But "it is the constant drop that wears the stone." I shall patiently go on, in the certainty of doing good, that, by one and the same process, will enlarge its own channel, while it purifies its waters. I feel that I cannot continue to speak of the broad and bright principles of Christian faith, and hope, and love,

---

* I may here also mention, that I am forming a Sunday and General District Library, and shall thankfully accept of any proper publications for the use of it. The London Society's Tracts have hitherto been almost the only ones that I have circulated to any extent in my district.

without in time producing an effect, that shall not only be of service to those who statedly hear me, but shall eventually put to silence all rumours and surmises which would represent my ministry as being one that has proselytism for its root. Proselytism is indeed its root, but such as has reference, not to matters of speculative, but of practical religion—not to the little segment of the dial of eternity, which is defined by the shifting shadow of the orthodoxy of the hour, but to the far larger portion of it which lies open and shadowless in the day, and in which the creeds of all sects, like the hours which represent them, are massed and mingled together in one levelling glow of Christian light and love. * *

I feel as if I ought not to conclude this paper, without briefly mentioning, that I hope, in the course of the next year, to see two new plans in operation, in the benefits of which the inhabitants of my district will share in common with others. One of these is the portioning and setting out of a piece of ground for Juvenile Gardens, in the way which has been adopted with much success at Brighton and other places. If successful with us, there can be no question as to the utility of the plan, since the habits of forethought, industry, observation, love of nature, &c. which it encourages, will give a happy bias towards "the better part" to many an unformed mind, the workings of which, though so interesting, are doubtful, and may incline it, according to circumstances, to the life of the Christian or of the felon.

The other plan is that of a Friendly Loan Society—the loans being made *upon security*, and to be repaid *with interest*. In fact, (in all but this last particular,) this plan is already in some degree of operation, the sum of 10*l*. having already been placed in my hands, to make a commencement. The success has fully answered my expectations. I have been enabled to lend 12*l*. upon the 10*l*., though the first loan was only made on the 10th of September,—the instalments having been paid, in every case,* with regularity and thankfulness. The amount of distress thus undegradingly relieved, has been as great as it was affecting. This admirable plan has been tried for several years in other large towns, and always with the same results of good and happiness. I rejoice that it is brought to our doors. The *Liverpool* Society, however, is not yet formed, though there can be little doubt that it will be so, as soon as the necessary inquiries, &c. can be gone through. I look to the formation of it with the assurance of its complete success. It will do good that will strongly counterwork the evil of many well-intentioned but most injudicious and injurious charities. In itself, it will not belong to them even by name. It will compromise no poor man's independence. After receiving its full benefit, he will only stand *more* erect than before. To the formation of this society, I look with confidence, as the commencement of a new series of better and truer helps for the local poor.

It only remains for me to discharge the grateful duty, of thanking you for all the friendship which I and mine have experienced from your kind hearts, and for all the aids which have been poured upon my ministry by your generous hands. May God reward you for both! and may they never be more thrown away than they have been on,

---

* In two or three cases, double the instalment has been paid; and, in one case, 13*s*. at once instead of 1*s*. 6*d*.

Dear Friends,
Yours, with affectionate respect,
J. JOHNS.

24, *Nile Street, Oct.* 2, 1839.

* * * * * *

At Mr. Thom's suggestion, coinciding with the wishes of some other valued friends, I gave at the close of my last Report, some extracts from my Note-book. These have been read with such unexpected interest, that I am induced to add a few more of the same kind. I give them very much as they appear in my papers, aware that their value, whatever it be, has nothing to do with their literary execution.

Extract 2.—I found ——'s family (—— court) in the greatest distress. The father is dead, the fever having terminated fatally. Five of his children have had it with him; but they are recovering, and crowding round the fire in various degrees and stages of pallidness and emaciation. The poor mother, I fear, is going to have it; and, if she has, there seems little hope for her. It was a heart-rending spectacle altogether. I could not but recollect, how recently I had entered their house, and saw the father in the pride and strength of life, turning an eye like a falcon's upon me, in which there seemed the glowing life of years. I then asked him, in reply to his statement that his family took up the whole of his wages, " But what would you do, if a fever were to take you down?" His answer was, " Very true, as you say, sir." How little did I think that my argument was so prophetic!

Extract 3.—In a cellar in —— street, I lit upon a touching spectacle. A widow with three or four children inhabits it. Two of these, her eldest girls, sat by the little fire. One was obviously ill. I came forward to ask what was the matter. Neglecting herself, she replied that her mother was ill. I looked on the bed—it was of shavings—and her mother lay on it, evidently very ill. I gave her a dispensary note (for she had had no advice), and went to her landlady's above. She told me that such had been their distress, that one of her own lodgers had sent them down a shilling that morning, which the sick woman had received with thankful tears. She had no blanket—and I engaged the landlady's niece to come up in the afternoon for one, in which it gladdens me to think that the invalid is now lying.

Extract 4.—I was much interested by a conversation held this morning with a very original Welchwoman, Mrs. ——, of ——. Her husband, she said, was a very bad English scholar. He could understand little or nothing of an English sermon, " without they say *God Almighty*, or *Jesus Christ*, or such things as them." The frequenters of an adjoining ale-house often annoyed her on a Sunday, by swearing, quarrelling, &c. in the court.—" Your blood would boil, and go cold again, to hear them," was her expression; and she assured me, that she had often " prayed to God Almighty for a shower of rain," to disperse them, and believes that her prayer has sometimes been not only heard, but granted. She has prayed, too, for the conversion of her husband from drunkenness, and is surprised that this has not been accorded. Few things are less understood among the lower classes than this—the nature and agency of prayer.

Extract 6.—Much gratified by a sight I witnessed this evening. It was at the ——'s Mrs. ——'s lodgers, who have that poor consumptive boy. The child was sitting up—his eyes fit for a spirit, his face as fit for the grave. His father was making a ship for him—finishing its minutest parts with a nicety, in which it was easy to perceive the blended feelings of the father and the sailor. He went to sea at eleven, and has "followed it" forty years. The pale boy was looking on with such a depth of interest at his father's work! I asked him where his pain lay. In a hoarse whisper he replied, "In my breast."—His mother has since told me, that "he will not so much as moan in the night, for fear of waking his father, and unfitting him for his hard day's work."

Extract 10.—At Mrs. ——, in ——, I found that her neighbour, Mrs. ——, had been confined, and was very ill after it. She had desired repeatedly to have some minister "to read to her," thinking, and, I believe, having been told that she was dying. Her husband had till then declined applying to any one, saying that she would be better by-and-bye. I went over immediately; and, being asked up, the sick woman turned her eyes upon me with such an intense gaze, and grasped my hand so firmly in her damp and hot one, that it took me a moment or two to compose myself. While I remained at her bed-side she never let go my hand. She was not, however, composed enough to join me in devotion; and I am to go down again to her this evening. Nothing can describe the gratitude and trustingness of her demeanour. On my asking her if there was any thing on her mind that gave her pain, she said, nothing, except that she had not been "*so kind as she should have been*" to one of her neighbours, whom she named. I offered to take a message, expressing her regret upon this subject, if it would at all relieve her mind; and the offer was thankfully accepted. Every day I learn something in this wonderful school; but one of the sweetest of these lessons has come from this poor woman.

Extract 12.—Heard to-day of a woman who had *lent* her only child to another, who wanted to obtain the Ladies' Charity, but could not without having a living child to produce. Place, person, and all circumstances were stated to me by Mrs. ——; and I have little doubt, not only that this particular statement is true, but that the public charities in general are liable to the grossest impositions. I have known persons —*whole families*—who drew almost their entire subsistence from them, and who yet were as thoroughly thankless, as they were morally undeserving. On the other hand, it is a conviction which gains daily strength from all that I see and hear, that the cases, which almost exclusively *deserve* the attention of these institutions, are those which are least likely of all to know of them, or to come before them.

Extract 15.—One sight of pleasure I have seen this day. It was the D.'s removed from their wretched and unwholesome cellar into a house of their own in a court adjoining. I went to see them there, and saw symptoms of decided and progressive improvement. They are *raisable* people, and I hope I shall raise them. "To such my errand is; and but for such," I could not proceed with my work.

Extract 18.—Learned that, within a week, a poor woman, whom I did not know, had been brought to bed, lost her child, died after it, been buried with it, and her husband sent to the Infirmary. Her three surviving little ones were there dining on a stranger's potatoes; and I learned that he had pawned his best coat for 14s. 6d. for their mother's grave. With what a truly evangelical beauty does human kindness shine out from scenes like these! For one kindness that the rich show to the poor, I firmly believe that they show twenty to each other.

MANCHESTER COLLEGE, YORK.

The Trustees of York College met on Thursday and Friday the 19th and 20th of December, in Cross Street Chapel Rooms, to take into consideration the question of the removal of the College to Manchester or to London. After protracted and interesting discussions upon both days, a vote was taken on the Friday evening after six o'clock.

Thirty-two Trustees were present at that late hour, and of these a majority of two decided for the removal to Manchester. Mr. James Heywood presided on the first day of meeting, and Mr. Shore on the second.

CONTENTS.

ART. PAGE.

I.—The Nature and Design of Christianity investigated from an Analysis of its Primitive Records, contained in the New Testament 119

II.—The Character of the Italian Statesmen of the 14th and 15th Centuries 137

III.—The Spirit of Truth that guideth into Truth . . . 150

IV.—Heine 164

V.—A Discourse on the latest Form of Infidelity. By Andrews Norton 169

VI.—Socialism 186

VII.—Mémoires de Luther 197

VIII.—The Religious Controversies of the Times . . . 205

IX.—Traditions of the East 208

X.—Children's Books 211

New Publications :—

I.—Letters on Unitarianism 216

II.—Geraldine 218

III.—The Works of William E. Channing, D.D. . 219

THE
CHRISTIAN TEACHER.

Art. I.—THE NATURE AND DESIGN OF CHRISTIANITY INVESTIGATED FROM AN ANALYSIS OF ITS PRIMITIVE RECORDS, CONTAINED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

No. I.—The Primitive Tradition of Christianity, as exhibited in the three first Gospels.[*]

I.

1. The researches of critical theology have little apparent connexion with the practical edification of mankind. But the provinces of religion and theology are already so confounded in the views of most men, that it is impossible to keep them wholly distinct.—When the authority of the Church of Rome was overthrown, a dogmatic, took the place of a ritual, Christianity; and this introduction of creeds, as the bond of ecclesiastical association, made every private Christian, who thought about

---

[*] The word *tradition* (παράδοσις) is here employed on the assumption, which cannot reasonably be questioned, that the Gospel was at first diffused *orally*, and only gradually passed into a written state,—in the same sense, in which Luke has used the verbal form of the term in the preface to the first part of his History of the Origin of Christianity: καθὼς παρέδοσαν ἡμῖν οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου.

It may be necessary to state here, once for all, that in the ensuing analysis of the contents of the New Testament, no attempt will be made in the first instance to reduce the results of it to a conformity with any assumed standard either of theological or of philosophical truth. An *à priori* construction, of whatever kind, rational or dogmatic, of the teachings of the New Testament is the most effectual method that can be devised of preventing a clear and impartial insight into the nature and design of primitive Christianity. Why should the inductive system be less applicable to the investigation of religious truth than to other inquiries? According to the principles on which the following investigation will be conducted, the several parts of the New Testament, produced at different times and under different circumstances, and proceeding from different authors, must be regarded as separate and independent wholes, to be interpreted at first by themselves, or at least with only a general reference to the known circumstances of early Christendom. When the collective results of such an analysis are fairly laid before us in all their fulness and variety, without any attempt prematurely to systematize them,—it will be the next step to compare them with each other, to mark their agreements and their differences, and to bring the entire mass of phenomena thus evolved into comparison with the historical development of providence, the spiritual wants of society, and the immutable principles of reason and morality implanted in the human race; and in this manner to proceed finally on the sure his religion, more or less of a theologian.—If, however, creeds are essential to salvation, and the texts of the same Scripture are alleged on behalf of contradictory creeds,—a final authority must be appealed to somewhere, to determine, amidst such conflicting claims, which is entitled to a preference.—Church authority cannot be rationally or safely abandoned, so long as man's salvation is staked on the reception of a particular creed. To prevent the necessity of adopting such an alternative, we must learn the right method of using the books, from which all creeds professedly derive their ultimate constituents.

2. If the teachings of Christ and his Apostles be the source to which we are directed for the ascertaining and fixing of our religious faith and principles,—before we embrace any positive system,—we should analyse in succession, without reference to dogmatic conclusions, the several books, of which the New Testament consists.—When the nature and design of Christianity have been thus deduced, by fair grammatical interpretation, from its primitive records,—when of no part of these records the obvious meaning has been constrained or modified, to make it agree with a dogmatic system or an assumed standard of rationality,—when nothing has been taken for granted as to the character and authority of the records themselves, beyond the simple fact of their being the earliest and most authentic documents, to which we have access;—it will then remain for us, to bring the results so deduced into comparison with the great facts of universal history, the analogies of providence, and the principles of reason and morality wrought into the original constitution of the human mind,—and, in this manner, to determine the relation they should hold to our general system of faith and opinion.—This, I am persuaded, is the only course, by which the unprofitable disputes of sects can be finally put to rest.—Upon the claims of dogmatic systems, elaborately

---

basis of induction, to ascertain the permanent and essential in Christianity, and determine its relation to the general system of moral and religious truth. Such appears to me the true course of inquiry. I perceive the difficulties which it involves, and the liability to be misunderstood in impartially conducting it. But believing a satisfactory solution of the various questions involved in the nature and design of Christianity to be among the most important benefits that can be conferred on the world, I think every one is to be commended who contributes what he can in the love of truth and goodness towards the attainment of so desirable a result. The edifice of truth is not constructed by a single hand, or out of one solid block; the smallest stone, if inserted in its proper place, forms a part of the whole, and furnishes its share to the general stability and symmetry of the building. I am more anxious to excite inquiry and obtain further instruction, than to establish a particular conclusion. My first wish is to know the truth. I shall welcome it, from whatever quarter it may be offered; and shall reserve my warmest acknowledgments, not for those whose concurrence may haply confirm me in prejudice, but for those who in the spirit of kindness and sincerity shall convict me, in any instance, of error and precipitation.

wrought out, held together by a firm tie of logical consistency, and supported by an ample array of insulated texts of Scripture, —it is difficult for the most acute and powerful intellects to decide.—But when the several portions of the New Testament have been studied connectedly in due succession,—any man of fair understanding and prepared to bestow on the subject the needful thought and attention, will be able, with such help as the accessible sciences of history and antiquities readily afford, —I do not say, to understand at once every individual text, as it occurs to him, but, at all events, to acquire a clear and consistent impression of the general character and tendency of the entire work; and, this impression once gained, he will go back with a great accession of intelligence to the elucidation of the obscurities which presented themselves, when he first applied his thoughts to the subject.—With a view to assist the private Christian in conducting such an examination, I propose in a series of papers to bring out, as clearly as I am able, without regard, in the first instance, to possible inferences or practical applications—the true character and meaning of the different books of the New Testament.—The nature of a periodical publication renders brevity indispensable; and I can only exhibit, in a condensed form, the general results, which I have myself drawn from a careful analysis of those books; and which I earnestly invite all who are desirous of truth to verify or correct for themselves.

3. It is no part of the present inquiry to examine the proofs of the authenticity of the New Testament. The value of those proofs we shall be better able to appreciate, when we have previously made ourselves acquainted with its contents. I simply assume here, that the writings, which it exhibits to us, are the primitive documents of Christianity; and that, if the nature and design of the religion cannot be ascertained from them, no means exist of coming to any satisfactory conclusion respecting it. We know from the evidence of Irenæus, Tertullian, and Clemens Alexandrinus,* that before the close of the second century the four Gospels, as we now have them, were recognised by the Catholic church as authentic narratives of the life and ministry of Jesus, and, as such, had been separated by it from the great mass of writings previously in circulation. In the interval then between the close of the second century and the first preaching of the apostles, our present Gospels were produced.—That ascribed to John is so different in its character from the three first, which have evidently been composed out of

---

* *De Wette, Einleitung ins N. T. § 76; Strauss, Leben Jesu. Einleit. § 13, p. 71, 3rd edit.; Norton's Genuineness of the Gospels, Part II. ch. i.*

the same materials, and embody a common tradition, that I shall reserve it for a separate examination, and confine our attention at present to the three first, or as they are now not unfrequently designated, the Synoptical Gospels.*—The relation of these three first Gospels to each other,—the principle, as yet undiscovered, which has determined their remarkable verbal coincidences amidst many discrepancies and variations—presents one of the most curious problems in the history of criticism, on which the sagacity of learned men has exercised itself. It is probable, that we witness in them the last results of a process of gradual formation, which had been going on for a century and a half. It must never be forgotten, that the earliest Gospel was wholly oral,—propagated by the mouth of preachers, and not circulated in books.—Could we now recal all the circumstances which attended the irregular and, under providence, the casual conversion of the several parts of the primitive Christian tradition from its oral to its written state,—we should no doubt discover the origin of many of the phenomena, which distinguish the composition and mutual relation of our three first Gospels. The written word was not in the first ages, as with us, the direct and only source of belief and knowledge, but itself came gradually into existence, through the impulses and demands of a faith already nourished by a living stream of tradition, of which it fixed the most important features, and arrested and embodied the most valuable elements. The results yielded by an analysis of these Gospels confirm the supposition that they originated in the way described.—The disjointed juxtaposition of their several parts, the abrupt transitions, the disregard of a distinct chronology, the short and fragmentary character of the separate narratives—all wear the appearance of a collection of memoranda and anecdotes, preserved and reduced to writing, while the oral tradition of the events, to which they refer, was still active and vivid in men's minds and furnished many a collateral illustration of discourses and actions, which have come down imperfectly explained to us.†

---

* In 1818 De Wette and Lücke published at Berlin a very useful and popular work, the title of which probably gave rise to the designation referred to in the text: "*Synopsis Evangeliorum Matthæi Marci et Lucæ cum parallelis Joannis pericopis ; ex recensione Griesbachii, etc.*"

† Schleiermacher in a well known Essay has explained the composition of Luke's Gospel on these principles; and a disciple of Schleiermacher's has thus very intelligibly assigned the probable stages of the process of formation: "neminem fere futurum esse existimo qui simul atque singulæ historiæ (he means the separate narrations, of which the Gospels are composed) in hæc satis certa verba conformatæ sint, totum hoc, quod tribus exemplis ad nos tramissum est, historiæ evangelicæ corpus uno quasi partu editum et singulis sui partibus plenum atque absolutum prodisse opinetur: nec desunt argumenta quibus ductus facile minora quædam historiarum

4. Our immediate object then, in the present paper, is to ascertain the view given by the three first Evangelists of the ministry, doctrine and person of Jesus Christ. For the sake of brevity and perspicuity, I shall comprise what I have to say in relation to this inquiry, under the four following heads: 1. a summary of the principal events in the life of Jesus; 2. a classified view of the various supernatural agencies manifested in or by Christ; 3. a similar classification of the principal doctrines taught by him; 4. the general impression left on the mind, after the foregoing examination, of the character and person of Jesus Christ, and of the nature and design of his religion. Before entering on this analysis, it is simply necessary to keep in mind, as a general clue to the right understanding of the narrative, these few and well-ascertained historical facts; —that, at the time of our Lord's appearance, a very general expectation existed among the Jewish nation of the approaching fulfilment of their ancient prophecies, in the advent of a Messiah, who should deliver them from their oppressors, vanquish the heathen, and establish the pure worship of Jehovah in the earth; that with the wide dispersion of the Jewish colonies this expectation was generally diffused through the East, and excited attention even in the remoter provinces of the Roman empire;[*] that in the interpretation of the expectation some difference existed between the views of the Palestinensine Jews, and those of their brethren who imbibed their notions from the learned schools of Alexandria; that in the intermixture of Jews from all parts of the world, which took place at the time of the great annual festivals in Jerusalem, these oppo-

---

corpora agnoscas, quorum singulæ cujusque particulæ, quamvis diversis (ut credibile est) auctoribus traditæ, communi quodam inter se vinculo aptæ atque connexæ sunt, ita quidem ut etiam certis quibusdam et expressis formularum indiciis ab eis quæ aut præcedunt aut sequuntur distingui possint. Hæc igitur historiæ evangelicæ quasi corpuscula, quibus nostri scriptores usi sunt, quot numero et qua singula circumscriptione fuerint, videor mihi satis accurate demonstrare posse: cæterum utrum illos libellos quosdam fuisse an historiarum narratores ista loquendo ac docendo conjungere solitos existimaveris, ad hanc rem meam—nihil refert; quanquam si historiæ evangelicæ doctores una complexione plures narrationes protulisse fatendum erit, quid quæso obstabat quo minus illæ eodem modo conjunctæ et iisdem verbis expressæ etiam scriberentur, ante quam qui majora auderent totis evangeliis condendis animum adjecissent?"—*Lachmann, De Ordine Narrationum in Evangeliis Synopticis*, in the *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1835, p. 583.

[*] The often cited passages of Tacitus and Suetonius refer indeed immediately to a later date, but they imply the wide diffusion of the expectation at a much earlier period; and their remarkable verbal agreement in describing the oracle is so deserving of notice, as to furnish a sufficient excuse for placing their respective passages in one view again before the reader's eye: "Pluribus persuasio inerat, antiquis sacerdotum libris contineri, *eo ipso tempore* fore, ut valesceret oriens, *profectique Judæâ rerum potirentur*;" (*Tacit. Hist. v.* 13.) "Percrebuerat oriente toto vetus et constans opinio, esse in fatis ut *eo tempore Judæâ profecti rerum potirentur.*" (*Sueton. Vespasian. c.* 4.)

site views were brought into collision, corrected and neutralised each other, and gave birth to a public opinion which was one of the characteristics of the Jewish mind in this age; and that by all parties, Palestine, the land of their fathers, the scene, where their heroes had triumphed and their prophets taught, the seat of their temple and its venerated worship—was naturally looked to with religious awe as the probable theatre of the earliest manifestation of their Messiah.*—Under such influences, and in the midst of these expectations, Jesus was born and educated.

II.

1. Of the three first Evangelists, Matthew and Luke give an account of the birth of Jesus; Mark commences his narrative directly with the preaching of John. The two former very distinctly imply, that the conception of Jesus was miraculous and owing to the immediate agency of the spirit of God. Agreeing thus far, the two accounts are very difficult to reconcile in their details. That of Matthew seems to indicate† that the usual residence of Joseph and Mary was at Bethlehem; whereas Luke affirms that they dwelt at Nazareth. The murder of the children at Bethlehem ascribed to Herod by Matthew, and the general taxing referred to by Luke, could not both have happened within the period assigned them, since, according to the most probable computation, Herod died before the commencement of the vulgar era,‡ and Cyrenius was not President of Syria till five or six years after it.§ The flight into Egypt mentioned by Matthew, and the presentation in the Temple described by Luke, are also events, both of which it is hardly possible to conceive should have taken place between the birth of Jesus and the settlement of Joseph and Mary at Nazareth. It must further be regarded, as an unaccountable circumstance, that the extraordinary demonstrations of supernatural agency which are said to have attended the birth of Jesus, should not, in the excitable state of feeling which then prevailed on the subject, have produced a deeper and more lasting impression; but should so soon have passed away into comparative oblivion, that, for thirty years subsequently, Jesus lived in comparative ob-

---

* John vii. 31, implies that the precise place of the Messiah's birth was not known, though a very general opinion fixed it in Bethlehem. See Bertholdt's *Christologia Judæorum Jesu Apostolorumque Ætate*, § 18.

† Matt. ii. 23; Luke ii. 4.

‡ See Brinch's *Examen Chronologiæ Fl. Josephi*, in the Appendix to Havercamp's Josephus, compared with Joseph. Antiquit. l. xvii. c. 8—11.

§ Joseph. Antiquit. xviii. I. 1; also Winer's *Bibl. RealWort.* article, Quirinus.

scurity in the remote town of Nazareth. The historical, the doctrinal, and the exegetical difficulties attending these introductory chapters of Matthew and Luke, must be admitted therefore to be very great. Yet there is no critical evidence against them. They are found in all the earliest MSS. and Versions. With regard to Matthew, his account of the birth of Jesus is referred to in the earliest quotations of the Fathers, without the expression of any doubt respecting its authenticity. Whatever evidence exists, is in favour of these chapters having formed a part of the gospels of Matthew and Luke, from the time that they assumed their present form. Under these circumstances, while we may reasonably doubt whether they should be interpreted historically, it seems to me uncritical in the actual state of our knowledge to expunge them from the text. If exegetical difficulties are to be regarded as a valid ground for the exclusion of passages, the whole text of the New Testament may be reduced to the greatest uncertainty.

From his birth to his entrance on his public ministry nothing is recorded of Jesus, during the important years when his mind and character must have been maturing themselves for future events, except one most interesting incident, described in a few verses by Luke alone;[*] his accompanying his parents at twelve years of age to the feast of the Passover, and his surprising the doctors in the Temple with the acuteness of his questions and the maturity of his knowledge and understanding.

2. The public ministry of Jesus was preceded by that of John the Baptist. Of John's birth a miraculous account is given by Luke; who makes him six months older than Jesus, and their mothers cousins;[†] and describes the boyhood of the two almost in the same terms.[‡] Matthew and Mark introduce John at once upon the scene, without any account of his parentage. John was a preacher resembling in his stern and ascetic mode of life the ancient prophets, and employing as a symbol of conversion the rite of baptism or lustration, which had long been in use among the Jews.[§] His ministry had a reference to the religious excitements and expectations which have been already mentioned, as existing at that time throughout the Jewish world. The

---

[*] Luke ii. 41—52. It is remarked in a Rabbinical work, quoted by Wetstein in loc. 'a xii anno filius censetur maturus.' At the same age extraordinary proofs of wisdom are recorded of Samuel and Solomon. See Wetstein in loc.—Josephus (Vita c. 2. in a passage quoted by Strauss, *Leben Jesu ch.* 5. § 40) speaks thus of himself, when he was 14 years old: '*συνιόντων ἀεὶ τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ τῶν τῆς πόλεως πρώτων, ὑπὲρ τοῦ παρ' εμοῦ περὶ τῶν νομίμων ἀκριβέστερόν τι γνῶναι.*

[†] Luke i. 36.

[‡] Luke i. 80. Compared with Luke ii. 40.

[§] See Lightfoot on Matthew, ch. iii. v. 6. *Hebrew and Talmudical Exercitations.*

general strain of his preaching resembled that adopted by Christ himself in the commencement of his ministry: 'Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.' What had been the previous relation of Jesus to John, no facts are recorded to enable us to determine. We simply learn from the Evangelists, that the first public announcement of Jesus as a divine teacher took place at his baptism by John. John was averse to administer the rite, but Jesus overruled his scruples; and, the rite having been performed, the spirit is described, in nearly the same terms by all three Evangelists, as descending visibly on Jesus and investing him with divine power for the assumption of his prophetic office. At the time of entering on his public ministry, Jesus was thirty years of age.*

3. Immediately after these events, and before the actual commencement of his ministry, Jesus retires into the wilderness for forty days, and there sustains a conflict with the Devil. He is tempted to a wrong use of the miraculous powers, with which he had been recently invested; 1. for the supply of his own bodily wants; 2. for trying the power and protection of God gratuitously; 3. for the purposes of personal ambition and aggrandisement. All these temptations Jesus repels. Angels come and minister to him; and he returns in the power of the spirit† from the wilderness into Galilee, which was to be the earliest scene of his public ministry.

4. The first period of Christ's ministry, according to the three first Evangelists, was confined to Galilee. This period, in their narrative, is bounded at each end by events, which have a remarkable symbolical character. We have seen it was preceded by the temptation immediately following the descent of the spirit and the baptism; its transition to the next period, which was passed in Jerusalem, is marked by the transfiguration. Within the limits of the first period,‡ Jesus collects his principal followers; appoints the twelve; sends them forth as missionaries with power to contend against all the forms of moral and physical evil; exposes the hypocrisy and formalism of the Scribes and Pharisees, who resist his influence as an unauthorised teacher; confines his own labours, having been rejected in his own city of Nazareth, chiefly to Capernaum and the shores of the Lake of Gennesareth, including the region of Decapolis, but occasionally extends his excursions as far northward as the foot of Lebanon to the sources of the Jordan,§ and westward

---

* Luke iii. 23. This was the legal age for assuming sacerdotal functions. See *Numbers iv.* 3—47. Jesus however was not a priest but a prophet.

† Luke iv. 14.

‡ Matt. iv.—xviii.; Mark i.—ix.; Luke iv.—ix.

§ Cæsarea Philippi, Paneas. Matt. xvi. 13.

into the regions of Tyre and Sidon.* In this varied scene of his ministry, Jesus employs himself in the exercise of his miraculous powers, in calling men every where to repentance, and in inculcating the duties, which must fit them for admission into the kingdom of heaven. It is remarkable, that the nature of this kingdom is nowhere distinctly explained by Jesus, but seems to be assumed by him, as an idea already existing and sufficiently defined in the prevailing conceptions of the popular belief. The general character of our Lord's ministry in Galilee is beautifully described by Matthew;† "And Jesus went about all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom, and healing every sickness and every disease among the people. But when he saw the multitudes, he was moved with compassion on them, because they fainted, and were scattered abroad, as sheep having no shepherd." Two circumstances require notice in this period of the public life of Jesus; one, the message sent to him by John the Baptist from his prision, to know whether he was really the Messiah,‡ or whether they were to look for another; which, after the miraculous announcement of Jesus at his baptism, of which John was himself a witness, seems a very remarkable inquiry: the other, the injunction, with which Jesus usually accompanied the exertion of his supernatural powers, that it should not be made a matter of general conversation. From this last circumstance, so characteristic of the earlier period of his ministry, we can perhaps only infer, that it was the object of Jesus to propagate the principles of his religion quietly and silently, till men's minds and characters were prepared for a more open avowal of them, and to avoid a premature collision with the civil powers of the country. Towards the close of this period, we find him beginning to give his more confidential followers,—amongst whom Peter and the two sons of Zebedee are particularly specified,—no obscure intimations of the fate, which awaited him, and of the purely spiritual nature of his kingdom, and to check in them every manifestation of a worldly and ambitious temper. All the three Evangelists concur in placing at this particular point of the history his beautiful and touching rebuke of this temper by placing a little child in the midst of his disciples and holding it forth to them as an example. It is when the feeling expressed by this act first begins to manifest itself strongly in the actions and discourses of Jesus, and amidst the scenes and circumstances, which most clearly betray its influence—that the remarkable transaction of the transfiguration occurs. He is accompanied by his three confidential disciples to the top of a mountain; when his form and countenance are suddenly changed, and he is beheld conversing with Moses and Elias, one the founder, and the other the most distinguished upholder, of the Old Dispensation, who speak to him of his decease, which he should shortly accomplish at Jerusalem.[*] The same voice, which pronounced a benediction on him at his baptism, is heard again; and in the same words[†] renews the consecration of him for the next period of his ministry. He tells his disciples not to speak of what they had seen on the Mount, till after his resurrection; an allusion, which at that time they did not comprehend.

---

* Matt. xv. 21.

† Matt. ix. 35, 36.

‡ Matt. xi.; Luke vii. x.

5. The ministry of Jesus is now to be transferred to another scene, and to assume a more conspicuous character. He quits Galilee, and moves southward with a view to be present at the approaching festival of the Passover in Jerusalem. Scarcely any particulars of his journey are recorded, till he reaches Jericho; but Luke has availed himself of this interval in the history to insert a large collection of parables and discourses, extending through many chapters, which is exceedingly valuable as presenting under one point of view the condensed wisdom of Christ's teachings.[‡] From Jericho he proceeds to Jerusalem in a sort of triumphal procession, riding along the public road in a guise, which according to John's Gospel was afterwards regarded by his disciples[§] as a fulfilment of prophecy,—vast multitudes coming out to meet him, and hailing him as the great prophet of Nazareth, whose fame had come before him to the city. He now enters into open discussions with scribes and doctors; perplexes them with questions out of their own theology; and refuses to answer their inquiry respecting the authority by which he taught. His mode of life during this period has been recorded by Luke.[||] He spent the whole day in teaching in the outer courts of the Temple, where multitudes of heathens as well as of Jews were collected from various parts of the world; and at night withdrew with his disciples, as well probably for the sake of personal security as of rest and refreshment, to the retirement of the Mount of Olives. It is in this part of his life, that the Synoptical Gospels place the extraordi-

---

[*] Luke ix. 31.

[†] At the baptism, (Matth. iii. 17. Compare Mark i. 11; Luke iii. 22) *οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ αγαπητὸς, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα*: at the transfiguration, (Matth. xvii. 5. Comp. Mark ix. 7. Luke ix. 35) *οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ αγαπητὸς, εν ᾧ εὐδόκησα· αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε.*

[‡] Some writers have called this collection the Gnomology of Luke.

[§] John xii. 16.

[||] Luke xxi. 37, 38.

nary account of his violent expulsion of the money-changers and sellers from the Temple. The transaction is narrated as history; but from its violent character, so utterly unlike the general spirit of Christ's manners and feelings, I am strongly inclined to regard it in the same light, as the temptation and the transfiguration, viz. as a symbolical representation,—expressing in this instance the contrariety of his religion to the worldly and mercenary uses by which the Temple was profaned. The priesthood and members of the Sanhedrim were now determined to crush this dangerous reformation at once, but found it necessary to use extreme caution in executing their purpose, from the great and extensive popularity, which Jesus had acquired. They corrupted one of his followers, who betrayed to them the place of his Master's nocturnal retirement, and the hour, when he would be found there. On the day of the feast, Jesus ate the Passover in the city with his disciples; and on the same occasion instituted a memorial of himself, in which the bread and wine were made the symbols of his body and blood, about to be broken and shed upon the cross, for the ratification of the covenant of divine forgiveness. Retiring as night drew on to the solitudes of Mount Olivet, he was seized with great depression and distress of mind, which however he overcame by the power of prayer. After his apprehension by the officers of the priesthood, he was carried immediately before the council, who found him guilty of blasphemy, on the evidence of suborned witnesses, and judged him worthy of death. In the actual circumstances of Judea at that time, the sentence could only be carried into execution by the Roman Procurator; who, regarding Jesus as an innocent man, became weakly and dishonourably the unwilling instrument of the bigotted hatred of the priesthood. Jesus was crucified; and hung upon the cross from nine in the morning till three in the afternoon, when he expired, uttering with a loud voice a verse from the twenty-second Psalm. This event took place on the day of preparation, *i. e.* immediately before the sabbath; and the three Evangelists represent it as accompanied by darkness and earthquake and the rending in twain of the veil of the Temple; and Matthew adds the further circumstance, that the graves were opened, and that many bodies of the saints, which slept, arose. On the evening of the same day, Joseph of Arimathea, a man of rank and fortune and a member of the Sanhedrim, who had been secretly a follower of Jesus, came and begged the body from Pilate and deposited it in a new-made sepulchre. Matthew has an account, peculiar to himself, of the chief priests obtaining permission from the Governor to station a guard of Roman soldiers at the tomb, and of their sealing the stone, which was placed at its mouth, to prevent the disciples from stealing away the body by night. During the whole of the sabbath, the body rested in the grave; but at a very early hour on the first day of the week, the women, who had accompanied him from Galilee, brought spices to the sepulchre for the purpose of embalming the body. To their astonishment, they find the stone rolled away, the grave empty, and a divine apparition sitting beside it. In regard to the circumstances, which followed the resurrection, Matthew and Mark differ from Luke. The two former represent the angel, as saying that Jesus was gone before his disciples into Galilee, and that they would see him there; according to Luke, he simply reminded the women of what Jesus had said, while he was yet with them in Galilee. The narration of Matthew and Mark implies, that the several appearances of Christ to his disciples took place in Galilee, on the mountain, where he had arranged to meet them,* and terminates with a general commission to them to go and preach the Gospel throughout the world. On the contrary, Luke's account states, that the disciples continued in Jerusalem, where they were directed by Jesus to remain, till they were invested with power from on high; that he led them out to Bethany, and, in the act of blessing them, was taken up into heaven. Matthew does not describe the ascension at all; and Mark simply states it as a fact in a few words.

III.

Through every part of the history, of which I have now exhibited an outline, there is interwoven a perpetual description of agencies, which are incapable of reference to any powers within the known circle of causation, and of which Jesus is represented as the immediate centre and source. The history is divided into two grand compartments,—bounded on each side by the three remarkable events, to which I have already alluded, and in which Jesus is not so much the instrument as the subject of supernatural agency,—in which God acts not through him, but in him and on him:—I mean, the descent of the Spirit with the consecrating voice at his baptism; his transfiguration, accompanied by the same voice, consecrating him anew; and lastly his resurrection and ascension to the right hand of God. If we receive the introductory chapters of Matthew and Luke, as forming a part of the general tradition of the Church at the close of the second century, we must regard the miraculous circumstances attending the birth of Jesus, as the first in order of these divine influences, in which he was a subject rather than an agent.—In the intervals between these remarkable facts, which rise like majestic columns from heaven to earth, sustaining the broad arch of inspiration and blessing, expanded over them, we observe all the actions and events of the life of Jesus distributed, and Jesus himself keeping up by prayer that direct intercourse and communication with heaven, which was the distinguishing attribute of his earthly existence, and dispensing around him the divine influence of which he thus became the organ and medium.

---

* Matt. xxviii. 16.

Of the supernatural works ascribed to Jesus nearly all are healing and beneficent, and imply the presence and operation of power engaged in perpetual conflict with evil, moral and physical. He speaks of himself as the agent and representative of Divine Goodness,—of the Father; and of his ministry, as a ministry of love. Arrayed against him are the agencies of an evil principle, personified under the name of Satan or the Devil, and having under his control hosts of inferior and dependant spirits,—all of them at that time the firmest objects of popular belief. On this conflict of powers and antagonism of principles, —bearing no small resemblance to the dualism, which distinguished some of the early systems of Oriental philosophy, and which had probably tinged the speculations of the Jewish doctors, subsequent to the Babylonish captivity,—the true conception of the ministry of Jesus, as exhibited by the Synoptical Gospels, seems to me to rest. Moral and physical evil are supposed to be closely interwoven in their roots, and to have their common source in the malignant agency of Satan. To this evil power the miracles of Jesus are constantly opposed, and the character I have ascribed to them will more fully appear from the following classification: 1. The healing of demoniacs, under which term are comprehended persons afflicted with madness, lunacy, and epilepsy; as the real cause of these disorders was unknown, their origin was sought in the supposed influence of evil spirits: 2. The cure of ordinary diseases such as palsy and leprosy, and the rectifying of natural defects and contracted infirmities, such as the want of a sense, lameness, mutilation; all of which were believed to have some connexion with moral evil: 3. Among the different miracles, to which Jesus appeals in his reply to the messengers of John, one is this; 'the dead are raised up:' of this extraordinary exercise of supernatural power only two instances are recorded in the Synoptical Evangelists,—the raising of Jairus's daughter, which is common to the three, and the restoration to life of the son of the widow of Nain, which is peculiar to Luke. According to the then prevailing opinion, death was regarded as a consequence of moral evil; as the source of all life was supposed to centre in God. Besides the healing and restorative miracles of Christ which I have just described, there were some, of which it was the object to relieve the present wants of his followers. Such are the two cases of his feeding vast multitudes with a very small supply of provisions. Another class of his miracles is closely associated with the sea-faring life, from which his earliest followers were taken, and evinces his knowledge of the secrets of nature, and his command over the elements; such are the miraculous draught of fishes, the finding a piece of money in a fish's mouth, his walking upon the Sea, and stilling a tempest on the Lake with a word. His healing influence flowed from him independent of any direct effort of will, and was capable of being exerted at a distance; of the latter we have an example in the healing of the Centurion's servant; of the former, in the case of the woman with an issue of blood, when Jesus felt that virtue had gone out of him, and in the general statement of Luke,* 'that the whole multitude sought to touch him; for there went virtue out of him, and healed them all.' Two only of the miracles of Jesus, recorded in the three first Gospels, have a stern and destructive character; the expulsion of the legion of devils into the herd of swine; and the cursing of the barren fig-tree. The violence of the former seems to bear a sort of proportion to the malignity of the demoniacal possession, which it had to encounter, the powers of good and evil being here brought into deadly and critical conflict,—and has perhaps a reference to the feelings entertained by the stricter Jews towards the animal, which was the subject of the miracle, and to the fact of the country, where it was wrought, being chiefly inhabited by heathens. With respect to the cursing of the barren fig-tree,—it seems to me not impossible, that it may be a figure from one of our Lord's discourses, in which he so constantly borrowed similitudes from trees and fruit,—which has passed through the transforming process of tradition into the shape of an historical fact. With these two exceptions, the miracles of Jesus are all merciful and benignant; a demonstration of his sympathy with good and hostility to evil, imbued with the same moral spirit, which formed the living heart of his character and ministry, and only giving to it a superhuman dignity and loveliness of expression; every where overcoming evil with good; and contrasting in this respect most remarkably with the terrific and vindictive character assigned to the miracles of Christ in the apocryphal Gospels of a later period.

---

* Luke xi. 10. Compare Matt. xiv. 36; Mark iii. 10; vi. 58.

IV.

The doctrine of Jesus is closely identified with his ministry and his life. His actions and sufferings are the most eloquent exposition of the principles, which he taught. So far however as his doctrine can be separated from his person and character, it may be considered as relating chiefly to his conception of the kingdom of heaven; the circumstances, which should precede and announce its commencement;—in what it should consist;—and how men were to prepare themselves for it.

1. That the kingdom of heaven should come within the limits of the then existing generation appears to me to be the only fair and legitimate construction, which can be put on the words of Jesus in relation to this event. He disclaims for himself all precise knowledge of the day and hour;* yet it is evident he supposed it to be close at hand. He makes a distinction, which runs through all his discourses, between the present age, generation or world, and that which is future or to come. The one would terminate, and the other commence, with the appearance of the Son of man in the power of his Father to raise the dead and judge the world. With this event the destruction of the existing order of things would be associated,—especially the overthrow of the Temple and the dissolution of the Jewish hierarchy. The two events of the end of the world and the destruction of Jerusalem, which stand closely connected in the recorded language of Jesus, some commentators have endeavoured to separate. But the line of distinction, which they attempt to draw, is altogether arbitrary. Any one who reads the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth chapters of Matthew without prepossession, cannot doubt, that they relate to one and the same connected subject,—Christ's appearance from heaven and the end of the world, or rather the termination of the existing age or *æon*. Other passages render this view certain: ‘there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom’ (Matth. xvi. 28); ‘ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come’ (Matth. x. 23); ‘this generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled’ (Matth. xxiv. 34). That all these things should not have been literally fulfilled within the

---

* Mark xiii. 32.

period assigned, and that only that portion of the prediction, which relates to the destruction of Jerusalem, should as yet have actually come to pass,—is no doubt a doctrinal difficulty; but our present object is simply to exhibit the result of fair, unforced interpretation, not to examine the question of the extent of the powers of our Lord's divine commission.

2. The kingdom of heaven was not to commence, till Christ's appearance in glory. It was to present the triumphant issue for good of the conflict between good and evil, of which Christ's preparatory ministry exhibited the most striking manifestation. The whole world was then to be summoned to the tribunal of Christ; their merits and their demerits examined; and a lasting separation made between the righteous and the wicked. All the children of God were to dwell together in everlasting peace and happiness. All the children of the Devil were to be cast out with him into outer darkness. The tares should no longer be permitted to grow up together with the wheat, but the one should be gathered into the garner, and the other burnt in the fire. The Son of man should send forth his angels, and they should gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; while the righteous should shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. Jesus declared his own mission and that of his apostles to be immediately confined to the Jews; and yet, in the progress of his ministry, he gave no doubtful intimation, that virtuous heathens, who had the right spirit, and hearkened to the truth as it came to them, would be comprehended in the kingdom of God, to the exclusion of many unworthy descendants of the patriarchs.

3. The general preparation demanded by Jesus of his followers for the approaching kingdom of God consisted in faith and repentance,—faith in his own prophetic authority, and repentance or rather change of mind, as the condition of the remission of sins. But though connected with such exciting hopes and expectations, the preaching of the prophet of Nazareth was untainted with fanaticism and enthusiasm. It is cautious, sober and practical. It shuns all gratuitous collision with the secular power. It enforces every precept of the moral law with the utmost strictness, and maintains the obligation of the Mosaic constitution, until the actual arrival of the kingdom of God. 'If thou wilt enter life, keep the commandments' (Matth. xix. 17); 'Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled;' 'and whosoever shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven' (Matth. v). The morality of the Gospel, as deli-

vered by the three first Evangelists, is however marked by a spirit and character of its own; and this may be traced to the influence of two causes, powerfully acting at the time of its promulgation; the highly excited state of religious feeling among a large proportion of the population, arising from the general belief of the near approach of the Messiah's kingdom; and the extreme corruption, hypocrisy and worldly-mindedness of the professed guides and teachers of the people.—To the former must be attributed its remarkable spirituality, its contempt for worldly honours and advantages, and its regarding all the forms and usages of the Mosaic law, though binding for the time, as only prospective and introductory to a more pure and perfect state (Matth. xi. 11. Luke vii. 28.); to the latter, the reverence which it inculcates for the virtues of humility, simplicity, singleness of heart, unostentatious devotion, quiet and silent beneficence, and compassion for the multitudes of despised and neglected poor. Hence the benevolent consideration, which it uniformly manifests for the harlots, the publicans and the sinners, typified by the prodigal of the parable; and hence it's earnest and indignant condemnation—rising sometimes into a tone of impassioned contempt and scorn—(Matth. xxiii. 13—33) of the sanctimonious hypocrisy of the Scribes and Pharisees.

V.

Of the religion, whose earliest history and characteristic features, as preserved in the tradition of the three first Gospels, I have thus briefly described,—Jesus himself stands forth from the narrative as the living image and representative.—So powerful indeed, and so penetrating is the individuality of the mind of Jesus, that it overmasters, as it were, and fuses down into one homogeneous mass the fragmentary materials of which his memoirs are composed, and stamps every part of the collection with a profound impress of moral unity. He embodies the spirit, and realises the conception, of a true prophet, contending for the cause of God and man, resisting the corruptions of a worldly and tyrannical priesthood, and maintaining by his divine wisdom and in the exercise of his supernatural powers the warfare of good against evil,—in the last deadly and critical conflict between them before the advent of that state, which should secure to good its complete triumph and eternal ascendancy. He is presented to us in these Gospels, under the twofold title of the Son of man and the Son of God; and these names beautifully express the sublime relation which he filled. The reconciliation of man to God was the object of his teachings; his life and character are the exhibition of a perfect harmony between the Divine and a human will. Such is the impression, which a perusal of the three first Evangelists leaves upon the mind. They reveal to us a bright vision of moral perfection, vouchsafed but for a moment to the earth;—a form of superhuman dignity and mien divine, walking in the light of love, and dispersing, wherever it appears, the dark phantoms of pain and death and sin.

In this most beautiful, solemn and wonderful narration, the truly candid inquirer will find it impossible to deny, that there are difficulties, which it is easier to state, than satisfactorily to answer. With a mind open to every serious conviction, and yearning for the peace and repose of a settled faith, he will not be able to disguise from himself, the difficulty of distinguishing in every case between that, which is to be literally interpreted as historical fact, and that which must be taken as a symbolical expression of moral truth. But the strongest feeling of that difficulty—a difficulty, which concerns the head more than the heart, and must find its solution in science rather than in faith—will not hinder him from recognising in the moral significance and application of the narration, the deepest truth and the clearest reality. In these fragmentary recitals, of which I have here presented an analysis, he will contemplate with a profound religious emotion, not unmingled with awe, the mysterious germ and earliest unfolding of that higher life in the soul of man, which carries with it the evidence of its divine origin in the new impulse and direction, which it has given to the whole subsequent course of civilization; which, born and propagated, according to all human appearance, among a small confederation of Galilæan mechanics and fishermen—has yet left a deeper impression on legislation and morals, has given birth to profounder speculations, has breathed a gentler and holier spirit into arts and literature, and has stimulated to more disinterested and successful exertions of philanthropy—than any doctrine or principle ever yet developed by the statesman or the philosopher; and which, carrying with it the affections and the sympathies of the great mass of human beings—is still scattering the seeds of a future—and doubtless of a higher—civilization in those vast regions of the South and West, where Europe is continually extending the sway of her arts, her languages and her laws.

J. J. T.

ART. II.—THE CHARACTER OF THE ITALIAN STATESMEN OF THE 14TH AND 15TH CENTURIES.

THE Students of History may be distinguished into several classes, according to the various purposes with which they resort to its pages. Some read History as they would a Novel or a Romance. To them the interest of the narrative is the chief attraction;—it is in the language of Ossian, " A song of other days, a tale of the times of Old." With readers of this description, Herodotus, Livy, and Froissart will be especial favourites.

Others search the experience of former ages for lessons of political science; and seek among the Statesmen of past times for the wisdom which must guide the future. Such will turn with peculiar zest to the pages of Thucydides, Tacitus and Machiavelli.

A third class study History as the best school for acquiring a profound knowledge of human nature;—and passing over the annals which record public events and national occurrences, devote their chief attention to those writings, which, like the Lives of Plutarch, and the class of historical memoirs, develope the character and actions of those distinguished men, who from time to time have astonished or adorned the world.

Others again like Vico, Herder and Condorcet, seek in History a philosophical and comprehensive view of the progress of the Race from its commencement to its maturity.—To Students of this order, all times and all writers must be familiar.

There is yet another class,—the Antiquarians of History,—who like Heeren and Niebuhr, confine themselves to the elucidation of the remotest times, and labour with patient and unambitious industry to dispel the clouds which hang over the earliest traditional records of mankind.

To all these classes, except perhaps the last,—the middle ages of Italian History present peculiar attractions;—but to none more than to those who love to trace man's nature in its more striking and singular manifestations;—to whom passions in all their forms, and intellectual superiority in all its phases of development, are objects of especial interest,—who find in the action of outward circumstance upon human character, and in the grander but less usual spectacle of the operation of human character, in moulding and commanding even the apparent casualties of life, the deepest lessons both of our actual weakness, and our possible might; and who believe that, through a close investigation into all the various modifications of intellectual and moral being, lies the surest path to a charitable judgment, and a comprehensive sympathy with our kind.

The Italian Statesmen of the 14th and 15th centuries, appear to have a character distinct, and apart,—peculiar to their country and their age, and unmatched in any other History.* As such they are worthy of a more minute and detailed delineation than I am able to give. All I can now attempt will be to point out very cursorily a few of the most prominent of their distinguishing qualities.

The 12th and 13th centuries comprised the golden age of Italian freedom. Liberty; and the commerce to which liberty gives birth; and the wealth which springs from commerce; and the refinement of taste and devotion to literature, which wealth and leisure invariably foster,—flourished with a vigour which has no parallel, but in the brightest days of Greece and England. Throughout the whole of Italy, there was only one Monarchy, that of Naples—called par excellence, *il regno.* The rest of the Peninsula was divided into an infinite number of free cities and independent states,—all enjoying a republican form of government;—often bound in ties of the strictest alliance; more often warring with that vehement and irrational jealousy which has left traces even to the present day; but each having a separate interest,—a peculiar policy,—a distinct and unfettered sovereignty.

---

* The reader familiar with Tacitus will recognize a character not wholly dissimilar in his delineation of the emperor Tiberius, in the first six books of his Annals. "He there makes us intimately acquainted with a man singularly dark and inscrutable; whose real disposition long remained swathed up in the intricate folds of factitious virtues; and over whose actions the hypocrisy of his youth, and the seclusion of his old age, threw a singular mystery. He exhibits a character distinguished by courage, self command, and profound policy, yet defiled by all

'the extravagancy
And crazy ribaldry of fancy.'

He marks the gradual effect of advancing age, and approaching death, on this strange compound of strength and weakness;—the old sovereign of the world sinking into a dotage, which though it rendered his appetites eccentric, and his temper savage, never impaired the powers of his stern and penetrating mind, conscious of failing strength, raging with capricious sensuality,—yet to the last the keenest of observers, the most artful of dissemblers, the most terrible of masters."

The portraits of Louis XI. of France, as drawn by Philip de Comines, Bayle, Hallam, and Sir W. Scott, present many points of resemblance both to Tiberius and to the Visconti. "He ascended the throne (says Hallam) greatly endowed with all those virtues and vices, which conspire to the success of monarchs. Laborious vigilance in business, contempt of pomp, affability to inferiors, were his excellences, qualities especially praiseworthy in an age characterized by idleness, love of pageantry and insolence. To these virtues he added a perfect knowledge of all persons eminent for talents or influence in the countries with which he was connected, and a well judged bounty that thought no expense wasted to draw them into his service and interest." ......"As his end approached he shut himself up in a palace near Tours, to hide from the world the knowledge of his decline. His solitude was, like that of Tiberius at Capreæ, full of terror and suspicion, and deep consciousness of universal hatred."

Sir W. Scott thus describes him: "Brave enough for every useful and political purpose, Louis had not a spark of that romantic valour and pride, which fought on for the point of honour, when the point of utility had been gained. Calm, crafty, and profoundly attentive to his own interest, he made every sacrifice both of pride and passion which could interfere with it...... No man of his own, or of any other time, better understood how to avail himself of the frailties of others, or when to avoid giving any advantage by an untimely indulgence of his own. He was by nature vindictive and cruel; but as no touch of mercy ever induced him to spare, when he could with safety condemn, so no sentiment of vengeance ever stimulated him to premature violence. He was fond of license and pleasure, but neither beauty nor the chase, though both were ruling passions, ever withdrew him from the most regular attention to public business and the affairs of his kingdom. His knowledge of mankind was profound, and he had sought it in the private walks of life, in which he often personally mingled."

The invariable result followed. In such miniature States every citizen was, or might become, a notable and powerful man. The highest offices were open to his ambition—the welfare of the republic was identical with each individual. Each man felt that in labouring for his country he was toiling for himself; and that in holding the reins of Government, he was in fact, superintending and directing his own private affairs. Hence, the desire for power became universal, and predominant. Every citizen studied the art of Government, as one which it was his peculiar vocation thoroughly to comprehend; and the desire to rule made him early acquainted with all the stealthy and tortuous bye-paths of ambition.

With refinement and wealth came luxury, corruption of manners, pacific habits, and a love of ease. These were soon followed by the decay of patriotism, and the extinction of the military spirit. The defence of the State was committed to mercenary arms; and its ancient liberties were often compromised by the protection sought from the warlike captains of the age. The leading citizens now aimed at mastery, where formerly they sought only honourable pre-eminence;—and the desire to serve was exchanged for the ambition to enslave their country.

The path to Power, however, was still mainly to be trodden, —not as in the North, by brute force, or military skill, but— by the arts of civil policy. The Council-chamber more often than the Camp, was their field of battle, and their theatre of Victory. A profound acquaintance with men was therefore in greater request than knowledge of military tactics. The passions of the citizen, rather than the weapons of the soldier, were the arms which they wielded,—the instruments by which they rose. Hence was formed a class unrivalled in all the qualifications which enable men to achieve power, and fit them to employ it. Trained from earliest childhood to a penetrating observation of the motives, the feelings, and the interests of others, —and to the most subtle concealment of his own;—profoundly versed both in the foreign relations and the internal economy of the State;—looking upon pre-eminent station and the power which it conferred as the one thing needful;—and pursuing it throughout life with indefatigable constancy;—the Statesman of those times stands forth in History, a wary, sagacious, unfathomable man;—gifted with a perception of coming probabilities almost amounting to an instinct; endowed with various knowledge, enlarged views and a manly understanding; a profound dissembler—an irresistible persuader,—and holding an unlimited sovereignty over the passions of others, and his own.

Though differing from each other in the events of their career, as in some of the minor features of their character,—there is a sort of family resemblance among these Statesmen, which justifies us in comprising them all in one generic description. Castruccio Castracani, Cesar Borgia, and the family of the Visconti may be selected as among the most remarkable specimens of their class.

According to the account left us by Machiavelli (who has, however, on this occasion, mixed up a good deal of fiction with his history), Castruccio Castracani was a foundling, adopted by one of the noble families of Lucca, and educated originally for the priesthood. The bent both of his taste and genius seems early to have inclined him to the military profession; and Francesco Guinigi, a noble and influential citizen, enabled him to gratify his propensities, by receiving him into his service, and instructing him in all warlike knowledge. He soon became remarkable not merely for his superior skill in all manly and fashionable exercises, but for singular tact and discretion, and an intuitive insight into character, which never failed through life to procure him a speedy and despotic ascendancy over the minds of all with whom he had any dealings. After acquiring high military reputation in the petty wars of that period, he was employed by his Patron on several diplomatic missions of importance, particularly one to the rulers of Milan;—and the extraordinary talent and dexterity which he evinced in the conduct of these negotiations, enabled him to return to Lucca with a vast accession of celebrity.

Shortly afterwards his Patron died, leaving the guardianship of his son to Castruccio, whose character was now so high, and his influence so great, that he might almost be considered as Governor of the Republic. So rapid an elevation naturally gave rise to considerable jealousy; and Uguccione di Faggiola (a Pisan General whom he had himself introduced into the city, and who had the command of the Lucchese troops,) took advantage of a trifling pretext to seize and throw him into prison. After a very short detention, however, he was liberated by a popular insurrection; and employing well the opportunity, he soon, by a series of systematic and clever intrigues, procured his election as Prince of Lucca.

Now began a series of splendid victories, and sagacious alliances, which rapidly carried him on towards the grand object of his ambition, the sovereignty of all Tuscany. He obtained possession, successively, of Massa, Carrara, Pisa, and Pistoia; and cemented the strictest friendship with Louis of Bavaria, and Matteo Visconti of Milan; over the minds of both which Potentates he exercised unquestioned sway.

Hitherto, Castracani, though not remarkable for a single virtue, was yet unstained by any heinous crime, or any act of universal turpitude. During his late career of uninterrupted victory, however, discontent had arisen in the city which he ruled. The younger branches of the family of Poggio, to whom in a great measure he owed his elevation, considering that he had not adequately recompensed their services, conspired against him, seized his palace, and murdered his lieutenant. Stephen Poggio, the head of the family, no sooner heard of the tumult than he exerted all his authority to suppress it, and succeeded in persuading the insurgents to lay down their arms, promising to intercede for their pardon. Castruccio on his return cordially thanked the old man for his services, agreed to pardon the offenders for his sake, and invited them all to a splendid banquet. Stephen appeared with his whole family, confiding in the gratitude and good faith of his Host; but Castruccio had them all seized and assassinated in prison, including the old man to whom he was indebted for the preservation of his principality. Not content with this act of genuine Italian perfidy, he deliberately put to death all the citizens whose influence or ambition might make them formidable, destroyed their palaces, and built himself a fortress with the ruins. In this manner he effectually secured his power against any future insurrections.

He obtained possession of Pistoia by a singular stratagem. He secretly fomented animosities between two rival chiefs of that city, promising assistance to each; till at length they came to an open rupture. Each seized upon one portion of the city, and both sent privately to demand aid from Castruccio. This wily politician sent his lieutenant with a considerable body of troops to succour one party, while he led himself another detachment to the support of the rival chief. Both were of course received as friends by their respective dupes, and introduced into opposite quarters of the city. At a given signal they joined forces;—slew the two contending Pistoians,—and took and retained possession of the place.

Not long after this perfidious achievement, Castruccio obtained a splendid victory over the Florentines, and died a few days after the battle, leaving behind him the most brilliant Italian reputation of his age,—and telling his successor that he owed him two important obligations,—first for having bequeathed to him so large a principality, and secondly for having shown him how to govern it. Machiavelli sums up his character in these words: "Era grato agli amici, ai nemici terribile; giusto con i sudditi, infidele con gli infideli; nè mai, potette vincere per fraude, ch'ei cercasse di vincere per forza;—perchè diceva che la vittoria, non il modo della vittoria ti arrecava gloria."

The Viscontis obtained the sovereignty of Milan towards the close of the 13th century, and retained it in their family for several generations. Though varying in many particulars of their private character, they were all able and remarkable men, and all pursued the same uniform object, viz. to extend their sway over the whole of Lombardy. They rarely, if ever, oppressed the peasantry of their dominions, aware that in them lay the sources of their wealth. They were all admirable financiers, and took especial care to have their coffers invariably full.

Matteo Visconti, the second of the name who attained to any great celebrity, was the only one who preserved a decent reputation. The vicissitudes of an active and eventful life had rendered him enlightened in his views, skilful in his political arrangements, and profoundly versed in all the weaknesses of human nature. To these qualities he added rapidity of combination, prompt decision, and great military talents. He strengthened his family by judicious connections and alliances; and before his death, had extended his dominion over several of the Lombard Cities.

A generation later, passing over names of smaller note, we find Giovanni Visconti, who bequeathed a largely augmented territory to his three sons. The oldest wallowed in the coarsest sensuality; and by the insults which he offered to the honour of the noblest families in Milan, excited odium and indignation against the whole family. Under these circumstances, the two brothers, Barnabas and Galeazzo, decided that he would be better out of the way, and poisoned him accordingly. In a short time these men became the terror of the whole Peninsula. Their wealth was enormous, their ambition was unsatiable, and was pursued with an immovable perseverance, which could not fail of ultimate success. They were allied by marriage with the royal families of France and England. They made war upon every free state, and protected and subsidized every tyrant. At home, a stern and cruel, but sagacious despotism kept all in subjection. Abroad they were unmatched in the extent and subtility of their political intrigues.—They chose their ministers and generals with an extraordinary correctness of judgment, which never deserted any of their name. Their finances were always in good order; and they rewarded their partizans with exemplary liberality. Their cruelties and crimes at length induced the Pope to fulminate against them a Bull of excommunication. They compelled the Legates who presented it to eat the Bull with the leaden seals attached to it.

In 1378, the younger brother, Galeazzo, died, and bequeathed his portion of Lombardy to his son, whose first care was to obtain the whole by murdering his uncle Barnabas. This young man inherited the boundless ambition of the family. He was cruel, relentless, and perfidious; but the vices of tyranny had not weakened his ability. He appears to have possessed a genius of the first order; and to have united a daring spirit of enterprize to the extreme of personal timidity. He shrank from the sight of a new face or a naked weapon; yet could carry through the most extensive schemes, and the most dangerous intrigues with unflinching steadiness of nerve. He had the sagacity to distinguish talent wherever it appeared, and to bind it to his service by judicious liberality. In consequence, no man was ever better or more faithfully served. Grasping, unscrupulous, and unforgiving,—beloved by none—feared by all—he reigned by the force of intellect alone.

His son, Filippo Maria, had the same character on a smaller scale. Like his father, he united excessive timidity to a far-reaching and magnificent ambition, and like him had the art of discovering great talents, and attaching the possessors of them; but manifested far less steadiness of purpose, and constancy of will. With him ended the dynasty of the Visconti. They were succeeded by the Sforzas, a family in many respects similar.

Cesar Borgia was perhaps the most perfect epitome of the Italian Statesman of the 15th Century. He was, as is well known, the son of the Pope Alexander the Sixth, a man remarkable even among the successors of St. Peter for avarice, licentiousness and nepotism; the most dissolute of a dissolute profession,—the most grasping of an ambitious age. The Son bettered the instruction of the Father. His early youth was wasted in the mire of sensual indulgence. The common crimes of humanity, attained with him an unnatural magnitude. He seduced his Sister and murdered his Brother, in whom he fancied he had found a favoured rival. Ambition at length usurped the mastery over other passions. He was educated for the church, and had even attained the rank of Cardinal;—but he early quitted so unsuitable a profession, and obtained from Louis XII. of France the Duchy of Valence, and from his Father that of Romagna;—henceforward he bent all his energies to the extension of his territory and the consolidation of his power. By a series of skilful manœuvres both in diplomacy and war, he successively obtained Urbino, Perugia, and Piombino; attacked Bologna;—and hoped ultimately to make himself master of Tuscany. He governed all his dominions with an iron hand, but with the sternest and strictest justice. To the ambitious and the powerful, he was formidable and unforgiving; but the People felt all the rare and inestimable benefits of a strong and sage despotism; and became in consequence firmly attached to his government.

Two actions of Borgia's public career deserve to be peculiarly specified, because they called forth unbounded admiration at the time, and are therefore no less characteristic of the age which applauded them, than of the man who enacted them.

"When the Duke (says Machiavelli) had taken Romagna, he found it governed by feeble lords, who had rather robbed than corrupted their subjects,—and sown discord, rather than preserved peace,—so that this province was the prey of extortion, lawlessness, and all kinds of oppression. He judged it necessary to govern it strictly, and to reduce it to order and tranquillity. For this purpose he set over it Ramiro d'Orco, a resolute and cruel man, to whom he confided absolute power. He soon, by his severity, established order in the Province. The Duke then judged that so despotic an authority might become odious;—he therefore set up a civil court in the centre of the Province, with an excellent President, at which each city had its Advocate. And in order to win the affections of the People, since he knew that the former rigour had generated hatred, he desired to prove that the cruelties which had been practised did not emanate from him, but from the severity of his minister. For this purpose he seized Ramiro, and caused him one morning to be placed on a scaffold in the market place, divided in two, with a wooden block and a bloody knife beside him. The horror of which spectacle both petrified and pleased the People."

During Borgia's absence on his expedition against Bologna, a conspiracy was formed by the nobles of Romagna, whom he had deprived of their principalities, and was carried on with such secresy and skill, that in a short time they seduced most of his troops from their allegiance, and retook the Duchy of Urbino. Borgia saw the imminence of the danger; and while he applied to France and the Florentine Republic for fresh soldiers, he immediately opened a negociation with his enemies, and offered them very advantageous terms.—These men well knew with whom they had to deal. They knew him to be wily, faithless, and fiercely vindictive. They knew that his only object was to gain time, and throw them off their guard; yet so fair were his professions, so brilliant his promises, so consummate his dissimulation, that they suffered themselves to be cajoled into concluding an alliance with him;—and the reconciliation appeared to be complete.—Having by this time collected a force sufficient for his purpose, he proposed to the confederates to join him in an expedition against Sinigaglia. The place was soon reduced to capitulate, and Borgia was sent for to receive the keys of the Fortress;—the conspirators, whose suspicions his courteous demeanour and friendly professions had entirely laid to rest, came out to meet him;—his friends gradually and imperceptibly surrounded them; and as soon as he reached the house prepared for his reception, he gave the preconcerted signal;—the confederates were all seized, and the same night strangled in prison. The whole transaction appears to have been conducted with profound ingenuity, and is perhaps in all its details, the most splendid triumph of perfidy recorded even in Italian History.

Borgia is described by all his contemporaries, as a man of the most graceful and the gentlest manner; gay, open, frank in conversation; calm, passionless, inscrutable;—eloquent, insinuating and irresistibly persuasive. Quick in conception, and sudden in execution, he yet never hurried forward his projects, but waited with untiring patience till the fit moment arrived;—preserving during the whole period of mortal suspense, an unruffled, and even unoccupied demeanour.

The first consideration that occurs to us in perusing the history of these eminent men is, less the indisputable superiority of their intellectual attainments, than the peculiar conformation of their intellect itself. They held their power, not by the accident of birth, nor by the tenure of opulence or rank; but by the right of preeminent capacity, by the ascendancy resulting from wider knowledge and profounder skill. They were men who in any rank would have been remarkable; and who from any lowliness of condition, or through any impediment of circumstance, would have opened for themselves a path to power.—Their minds were in general well furnished with all the knowledge of the age.—They were liberal patrons, and competent judges, both of the fine and the useful arts.—The art of Government they had studied with all the attention which became men who looked to it as the grand instrument by which the object of their life was to be achieved. They were sagacious diplomatists, and admirable financiers. Agriculture, manufactures, and commerce all flourished under their enlightened sway. Their profound and penetrating insight into human character, alike in its weakness and its strength, was that, at once of the contemplative Philosopher, and of the observant and experienced worldling. Hence it was both deep and practical.

The general aspect of their minds was at once subtle and commanding. They were as fitted to awe as to persuade. Their manners, for the most part, seem to have been those of the dignified and polished gentleman,—mild, calm, urbane and imperturbable.—Unrivalled in the arts of profound dissimulation—consummate masters of perfidy—they appear to have been gifted with an insinuating and persuasive eloquence, which was wholly irresistible.—Men whose treachery was written in sunbeams—men whose faithless violation of the most solemn engagements was as patent as the day—were able to lull into unguarded security, and lure on to certain destruction other men whose maxim it was never to trust those whom they had once offended,—who perfectly understood the character of those with whom they had to deal,—and whose nearest kindred had already fallen victims to the same snare which was now laid for them. To such an extent is this observable, that it rather seems to resemble some inexplicable fascination, than the natural influence of one mind over another.—Borgia, whose very name had long been an epithet for all that was hollow, faithless, and revengeful, contrived to persuade Vitellozzo, who had rebelled against him, whom he had deprived of his estate, and whose brother had lately fallen a victim to vengeance for the same offence,—to place himself voluntarily in his hands,—though the infatuated man seems to have had a fearful presentiment of the melancholy fate which awaited him. With these dark and subtle intellects the spell of deception seemed never to wear out.

> "Cassandra's fate reversed was theirs;
> She, true, no faith could gain,
> They every passing hour deceive,
> Yet are believed again."

The next peculiarity that forces itself upon our notice, in the character of the Italian Statesmen, is, that no crimes however portentous—no vice however daring—no sensuality however loathsome,—ever impaired the vigour of their will, or disturbed the crystal clearness of their understanding. The usual enervating operation of vicious indulgence is not here perceptible. That merciless and thirsty cruelty which (as in Caligula and Paul of Russia) seems to be one form of mental alienation, was never more notable, or more unmeasured than in Eccelino of Padua, and in Barnabas Visconti. Yet both retained their splendid abilities and indomitable energy unenfeebled to the last. The dissolute habits of some among the Sforzas and Viscontis—the raging and capricious lust of Borgia,—and the wolfish avarice of the Duke of Athens,—co-existed with powers of mind, and an intensity of purpose, which the most virtuous politicians might envy and admire.

But the intellectual endowments of this singular race of men, splendid and rare as they indisputably were—were neither their most distinctive nor their proudest characteristics. That which in spite of savage vices and heinous crimes, compels a reluctant admiration, and imparts to the otherwise gloomy picture something of lustre and sublimity,—is the resolute tenacity with which they fixed their minds upon one object, and the stern determination—the unyielding constancy—the calm, energetic, untiring perseverance—with which, through all obstacles, they steadily pursued it. No quality imparts such dignity to the character as this undeviating devotion to one aim. It marks a mind of the highest order. It commands from us something of the awe and submission with which we regard the inevitable march of destiny.

The object of these men was Power. Their ruling passion was ambition—a common, and too generally, an unworthy passion,—but at the same time calling forth too much of the better portions and grander energies of our nature, to be condemned as altogether vulgar. But these Italians pursued it with a firmness and pertinacity which redeemed all its meaner features. They kept it steadily in view throughout the whole of life—turning neither to the right hand, nor to the left—rejecting all compromise—spurning all difficulties—trampling down all obstacles—shrinking from no danger—scrupling at no means, and sacrificing without hesitation or reluctance all other passions at the Altar of the Grand Idea. They were all violent, vindictive, or voluptuous men, and all their passions partook of the intensity of their character;—yet we constantly find the most violent controuling his temper—the most vindictive postponing his revenge—the most voluptuous denying his lust—when indulgence would interfere with the attainment of their end.—Knowing their principles, you could with unerring certainty predict their actions;—secure that no unruly desire—no amiable weakness—no human sympathy—would intervene to turn them from the purpose to which they had devoted all the energies of life.

Scruples of any kind, they had none. Religion—morality—honour—natural affection—they set equally at nought. The Pope's Bull of excommunication was thrust down the throats of the Legates who presented it. Falsehood and perfidy were their chosen instruments;—and the blood of a Father or a Brother was shed with as little remorse as that of a stranger. Castruccio (says Machiavelli in a passage already quoted) never attempted to conquer by force, where fraud would succeed as well, saying that it was victory, and not the mode of victory, that conferred honour. Macaulay has concisely summed up this portion of the character of an Italian Statesman. "With him the most honourable means are the surest, the speediest and the darkest. He cannot comprehend how a man should scruple to deceive him whom he does not scruple to destroy. He would think it madness to declare open hostilities against a rival whom he might stab in a friendly embrace, or poison in a consecrated wafer."

Some of these men whose career we have been considering, show us in strong relief, one peculiar and very uncommon feature in human nature, viz. the union in one person, of the highest moral courage, with the extreme of personal timidity. This was especially remarkable in two of the Visconti. Their minds were strong, but their nerves were weak. Cowards on the field of battle, they were warriors of heroic daring and indomitable resolution in the Council Chamber and the Cabinet.

The above remarks on the Italian Statesmen of the middle ages, may lead us to a juster appreciation of a Writer who has been much misrepresented, and seldom understood;—who resembled them greatly in character, though free from their worst vices, and unstained by any of their crimes. The writings of Machiavelli are an embodyment and elucidation of those principles of policy on which the most successful Italian Princes of that age habitually acted. The illustrations of his maxims of government, both in his Prince, and in the Discourses on Livy, are drawn almost exclusively from Italian history;—and the maxims themselves are in consequence, as might be expected, strictly and eminently national. On the *moral character* of any action, he never expresses an opinion; and indeed the consideration of the question seems never for a moment to have crossed his thoughts. The right, or the wrong, of this perfidy, or that murder, is entirely put out of view. The *suitability* of an action is, with him, the sole criterion of its merit. If the means employed are adapted to the end desired, they are applauded;—if otherwise condemned.

If these considerations are carefully borne in mind, the works of Machiavelli will be found mines of political wisdom, and deeply informed with a profound knowledge of men in their collective capacity. He combined, in a rare degree, the most excellent qualities of the practical, and the speculative Statesman. With the single exception of Mr. Burke—a mind of similar order, but of fuller developement, and far loftier elevation,—there is no statesman to whose writings I recur with half the zest. They are rich with the experience of a varied and eventful life, and with the meditations of a most reflective mind. His style is always simple, vigorous, and as clear as crystal;—and when the subject will allow it with propriety, (as in the noble and pathetic exhortation to deliver Italy from the Barbarian yoke,) rises to the purest order of fervid and impassioned eloquence.

Machiavelli was a true patriot, almost the last that Italy has produced. He sought neither power nor lofty station, for itself. His only ambition was to serve his Country. The dearest wish of his heart was to rescue her from her degradation, and to expel the ferocious barbarians who were devastating that pleasant land. For this he was willing to encounter any hardships, and to serve any masters.—The question whether the Medici or the Soderini should predominate in Florence, was to him of no moment when compared with the question whether Italy should be once more a flourishing and free country, or should continue the slave and the victim of her Northern Invaders. Hence sprung that independence of the trammels of faction, which has so often been imputed to him as a disgrace. But a dispassionate examination of his career, as of that of Lord Falkland, Burke, and Talleyrand, may lead us seriously to question, whether that fixed adherence to Party, now so strongly insisted upon, is not always a doubtful virtue, and may not sometimes become a positive vice. The claims of Country are of paramount obligation to the claims of Faction.

W. R. G.

Art. III.—THE SPIRIT OF TRUTH THAT GUIDETH INTO TRUTH.

What is this "Spirit of truth" which the Christian's master promises to the disciple? this "Holy Spirit" that taketh of the things of the Father and showeth them to the children? this "unction from the Holy One," that teacheth all things? this "Comforter," that is to abide with the church for ever, and without which it is no Church of Christ? What is this spirit of truth? what are its elements, and what its manifestations? And again, what are the influences that quench this spirit? what hindrances has it to encounter, what enemies has it to overcome?

The first of these questions is soon answered. The Spirit of Truth is simply, Love of Truth, based upon Faith in Truth and showing itself in a fervent, yet impartial pursuit of Truth. Its essence is Love of Truth; a supreme devotedness of the whole heart and soul, and mind, and might—a devotedness in which love is tempered only by reverence and worship—to Truth, Reality; to things as they are in themselves; to things as God has made them; such a love of truth as can say, "Welcome the beggarliest truth, so it be a truth, in exchange for the royallest sham." And its basis is Faith in Truth; trust in truth; by which I mean a faith and a trust that the True is also the Good, the Best; that God's ways are better than our ways, and his thoughts than our thoughts; that God's conceptions, as realised in the universe, are better than our conceptions as formularized in creed and system; that the actual existences and laws of the universe, as gradually disclosed by inquiry, will be found to be better than such existences as we could wish to see created, and such laws as we could wish to have enacted. This is the spirit of truth: and its manifestation will be fervour and impartiality in the pursuit of truth; untiring zeal in the seeking of that which *is*, with a perfect freedom from everything like a preformed desire of finding one particular result rather than another.—Such is the spirit of truth, that leadeth into truth. It is the simplest form of some of the simplest principles of our intellectual and moral constitution; it is the heart of the child, working with the intellect of the man.

The second part of the inquiry, unfortunately, will not be so soon disposed of. What is *not* the Spirit of Truth? what hindrances has the truthful spirit to encounter? what hostile influences, in man's constitution, condition, and social arrangements, has it to war with and overcome? This is a question, unhappily, not so easily disposed of as the former. Here we have to deal, not with the simplicity of Health and Nature, but with the complexity of Disease; we have to look into the morbid anatomy of the human mind: and the utmost we can hope to accomplish, will be such a brief and general survey of a few prominent points of the subject as must necessarily leave much to the reader's reflections.

We may name, first, as an influence fatally adverse to the truth-loving temper, *the spirit of worldliness and selfishness;* which incapacitates a man for any disinterested pursuit; still more, for a pursuit involving difficulty and effort; most of all, for the pursuit of things that lie afar off, in the region of the Absolute and Universal. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. The worship of Self and the worship of Truth are Religions which no articles of peace, no act of toleration, can force into friendly co-existence. Worldliness is essentially selfish; the Spirit of Truth, is essentially disinterested. The one implies a narrow and ever narrowing, the other a wide and ever widening field of intellectual view. The one deals with the near, the present, the particular; the other with the remote, the future, the universal. The spirit of selfishness and the spirit of Truth are antagonist forces and cannot work together. What is Truth, to the miser, the courtier, the man of fashion; to the man whose soul is sealed up in his money-bags, whose dreams are of making his fortune, whose worship is of the world's graven images? No; the spirit of truth is a spirit whom the world cannot receive, because it " seeth him not, neither knoweth him," nor careth to know him.

Again, *vice, sensuality, vicious and sensual passion,* are of fearful potency to quench the spirit of truth. There is a close and wisely appointed connection,—a connection that may truly be called retributive,—between the healthful or unhealthful state of the moral powers, and a correspondent condition of the intellectual; of those intellectual powers, more especially, which are concerned with the general truths of moral speculation. The pure in heart alone can see God. The pure in heart alone can see the truth which is of God and reveals God. The pure in heart alone can be followers of God as dear children, by treading that ascending pathway of spiritual progression, whose light shines more and more unto a perfect day, and ends in the glories of a beatific vision. There are many ways in which vice acts injuriously upon the intellect. The self-indulgent habits which vice implies, relax a man's mental energies, make exertion difficult and difficulty odious; while truth is not to be followed without exertion, nor appreciated without difficulty. The strong passions which vice implies, are constantly compelling the intellect to do their work; they pre-occupy it with ideas and images of their own: but the pursuit of truth is work for a free, unoccupied mind. And the cares, vexations, dissatisfactions, incident to a life of sense and sin, the alternations from elation to despondency, from the laughter in which the heart is sorrowful to the heaviness that is the end of such a mirth, disorder and perturb the mind, keep it in a constant ferment and irritation, and utterly disqualify it for that calm following of truth which needs the wisdom that is pure, peaceable and gentle. It would be easy, no doubt, to quote seeming and partial exceptions to this rule, as to others; especially as regards the pursuit of truth in the walks of merely physical science: but we believe such exceptions are not very many. Even the greatest physical discoveries have very generally been made by men of simple tastes, serene and trustful tempers, pure hearts, and virtuous lives; while in the nobler field of the moral sciences, the exceptions are still fewer. The great lights of the world have been, almost uniformly, men whose intellectual eyesight was clear, strong and piercing, because the heart was pure, and the conscience void of offence.

The next influence hostile to the spirit of truth that it occurs to us to name, is *a morbid distempered imagination:* by which we mean an imagination that cannot relish reality; an imagination that is too strong for the reason associated with it, and invades the province of reason; an imagination that is in love with mystery, hypothesis, complexity, and is not contented with its true office of waiting upon reason and picturing the ideas of reason with a new vividness and freshness, but must actually usurp the functions of reason, and philosophize and make theories for itself.

We are not going to disparage the imaginative power; we have small sympathy with the timid, jealous rationalism that shrinks distastefully from its contact: it is worthy of Him who gave it; it *is* a vision and a faculty divine; it and reason are not natural enemies; its strength is not the weakness of reason; its weakness is not the strength of reason; the men of largest and clearest intellect have, very commonly, been likewise the men of most wealth and fulness of poetic fancy; it is the usurpation by imagination of that business of speculative inquiry in which its real function is that of a ministering spirit,—this is its sin against the spirit of truth that leadeth into truth. The influence of an undisciplined, unchastened fancy, in checking the progress of inquiry by rendering the simplicity of truth distasteful, is illustrated with much fidelity and graphic power, in a few words of a French writer of the last century. "I am persuaded," he says, "that if the majority of mankind could be made to see the order of the Universe, such as it really is, as they would not remark in it any virtues attached to certain numbers, nor any properties inherent in certain planets, nor fatalities in certain times and revolutions of these, they would not be able, on the sight of this admirable regularity and beauty, to restrain themselves from crying out with astonishment, 'What! is this all?'"* We see the same temper in theological inquiry. There are men who will put down the Unitarian theology, not with theological argument, but with some such epithets as 'cold,' 'barren,' 'meagre'; epithets which do not mean that that theology is *false* and capable of disproof, but simply and merely that they do not admire it. There is something in imagination undisciplined by reason, unreclaimed to the love and obedience of reality, that turns coldly away from a religion that has no enigmas to perplex, no mysteries to astound, no sacraments to save as by a charm, and no hierarchy with its ascending scale of deacons, priests, and bishops, and its 'holy orders' linked by direct succession with the 'college of the Apostles,' as it is curiously termed—there is something in a vulgar imagination which turns coldly away from a christianity that has only the mind and life of Christ, and which throws itself delightedly upon the antiquity, apostolicity, numerical majority, liturgical pomp and sacramental magic, of the established church of England,—and would throw itself, even more delightedly, (were it only alive to the merit of consistency,) upon the yet higher antiquity, the more plausible apostolicity, the more commanding majority, the greater liturgical pomp, and the more various and imposing sacramental magic of the Church of Rome. This is not the spirit of truth, and it cannot guide to truth. Imagination is not the faculty that is to discriminate, analyse, compare, combine the elements of speculative thought. It once tried to give the world a philosophy, and a most extraordinary philosophy it was: there were long centuries in which the master spirits of mankind, most laboriously spent their strength in doing and helping each other to do—nothing; the grand revival of learning and science, at the close of what we call the dark ages, was simply the insurrection of Reason against imagination, of reality against hypothesis and fiction. A similar revolution must take place in Theology. Theology, the *science* of religion, must be treated simply as a science, with the dispassionate calmness that reasons and inquires, seeking only to know things as they are in themselves, assured that the True will always turn out to be the Beautiful and Grand; while to feeling and imagination may safely be committed the *sentiment* of Religion, which indeed is a thing of feeling and imagination that intellect can neither create nor destroy. This will give the true harmony of Faith and Reason; this will reconcile the sceptical spirit, distinctive of Protestantism, (and without which religion runs into the wildest errors,) with the believing spirit distinctive of Christianity, without which religion has no existence at all.

---

* Fontenelle.

Another influence fatally at variance with the truthful spirit, is *distrust of the practical consequences of Truth*; in other words, the want of *faith in truth*; the fear that truth may do harm, may 'injure the cause,' (as if men had any right to make for themselves 'a cause,' other than that of truth, all truth,)—that there may be truths, the discovery or declaration of which would be injurious to religion and morality, would shake the foundations of society, or impair the peace and virtue of the individual. This, of course, is destructive of the spirit of truth; it is a perfect paralyzer of the reasoning powers; it makes a man afraid of reasoning, and more afraid still of seeing others reason; it makes him look upon reasoning as a positively bad and dangerous thing. This distrust of truth, this jealous dislike of reality, may be the feeling of persons who persuade themselves that they are great believers, and could very conscientiously put their names to very long creeds; but, at bottom, it resolves itself into scepticism, and is in truth the worst sort of scepticism. Of course I do not mean 'worst' in the sense of moral delinquency—honest scepticism never is, never can be, a moral delinquency, in any manner or to any degree. I mean worst in its effects upon the mind and mental powers of the individual: —and for this reason, because it implies that man's errors are better than God's truths; it implies that the great author of that vast domain of speculation and reality, over which inquiry would range, is not a good, at least not a perfectly good Being; it implies that the great practical principles upon which society and social happiness are built, are false principles, and that inquiry would disclose their falsehood and make an end of their power; it implies, in short, that man cannot improve, and that his maker did not constitute him with a view to improvement, since every increase of knowledge will bring with it a decrease of happiness. This scepticism of truth is a mournful scepticism indeed. Yet it is not hopeless; it may be reasoned with; and when it is the scepticism of honest and thinking men, it will listen to reason. We may refer an individual who is so unfortunate as to be embarassed with it, to the past history of the human mind; we may show him how truths, the first promulgation of which led to much temporary evil, have, in their subsequent development, produced an immense overbalance of lasting good : we may take, for instance, such eras as that of the Protestant Reformation, when the first announcement of spiritual freedom to a world of slaves produced anarchy, revolt, bloodshed, and unnumbered crimes, public and private ; and yet who will deny—what intelligent Roman Catholic even will deny—that that same Protestant Reformation has wrought out, and is working out, results of vast and enduring beneficence. We may remind such an individual that Christianity itself, on its first promulgation, had a mission of destruction and disorganization ; that it unsettled the ideas, shook the institutions, broke the peace of the world ; that it brought not peace upon the earth, but a sword, "setting the father against the son, and the mother against the daughter, and the daughter-in-law against the mother-in-law ;" yet now, in its more matured results, this same Christianity is the great civilizer and conservator of the world, and the words just quoted from Christ's first missionary charge sound harshly and strangely in our ears, more like the calumnies of a foe to Christianity than the calm, far-seeing prediction of its anointed prophet. And we may point such a sceptic, finally, to the thousands of thousands of evidences, with which all creation teems, that the God of Truth is a good God, and deduce from them the cheering inference that truth also must be good. Thus are we to deal with the scepticism which would tell us that the spirit of truth which guideth into truth, is an evil spirit that misguides. And if, after all, we find that we argue without producing conviction, (and there will always, perhaps, be individuals whom a gloomy temperament or an unhappy experience of life renders it peculiarly difficult to convince,) we can only regret it. I would not ask such an individual to suppress his scepticism ; I would only recommend him, for consistency's sake, that he say nothing of the duty of free inquiry ; that he cease to talk, if he ever has talked, of the virtue of proving all things ; that he declare openly to the world, that he thinks truth a bad and mischievous thing ;—unless, indeed, he consider this very scepticism of his to be one of the mischievous truths ; in that case he may be silent, and neither help the cause of truth nor mar it, but leave others who happen not to be sceptics as to this article of the orthodoxy of human nature, to work out their own faith in their own way.

Akin to this distrust of the consequences of truth to the social and moral interests of man, we may mention a singular species of *superstition*, as another influence, eminently hostile to the spirit of truth which leadeth into truth. There are certain religious terrors, strange and melancholy to say,—and, stranger and more melancholy still, terrors that strengthen themselves with sanctions stolen from Christianity,—which grievously hinder the progress and fetter the action of the human mind. Men are actually made afraid of pushing their inquiries upon certain points of speculation, lest the results to which they are sagacious enough to perceive that inquiry would very possibly conduct them, should *give offence to the Almighty !* We have a familiar instance of what I now mean, in that very common objection to Unitarian views of Christianity, "that they are not safe views." How often we hear it said, that "even if orthodoxy be erroneous, it is an error *on the right side* ; that it is *safer to believe too much than too little* ; that it is dangerous to reject the Deity and atonement of the Son of God, and make light of the Divine scheme of redemption." Why, what an idea of God such reasoners must have ! If a man reject, *upon evidence,* the Deity and atonement of Christ, and, upon evidence, cannot adopt what other men call the Divine scheme of redemption,—nay, if a man so reject Christianity itself,—he is not a criminal ; he is not a bad man ; it only amounts to this—that a certain kind and mass of proof does not affect his intellect as it affects other intellects ; that is all. The error—when it is an error,—will be injurious to him, no doubt ; as every error is, more or less, to the mind that entertains it ;—but there is no crime in it ; and the will of God is better done, the truth of God is better honoured, by a man who freely and faithfully inquires and blunders into a false conclusion, than by one who, without inquiry blunders, by the accident of birth or education, into a conclusion that happens to be true. And we need not be afraid that our mistakes in theology will make God angry. We have quite as little to fear on this head for the Deist as for the Calvinist. If one man may safely believe all that John Calvin says of God, most surely may another man believe all that Benjamin Franklin says of God. Oh no ! the Divine Being does not feel, we may safely assure ourselves, all that irritable jealousy for *his honour* which some of his creatures feel for Him. It is not Christ that says, "The Lord your God is a jealous God." God is infinitely more dishonoured by the conception of his character implied in this dread of using the powers he has given, lest they should lead to results which He did not design—God is more dishonoured by this than even by the Sceptic's dismallest doubts as to his very existence.

We have already stated the influence of *selfishness and worldly interest* in quenching the Spirit of Truth, and attempted to illustrate that influence by a remark or two of a sufficiently obvious nature.—There is *one particular form of this influence,* however,—there is one mode in which the selfish and worldly spirit is brought directly in collision with the spirit of truth and truthfulness, by institutions and social arrangements that seem almost as if they were constructed for this express purpose, and this alone,—so widely prevailing and so disastrously effective, that we have thought it worth while to reserve it for a separate notice. We allude to certain ecclesiastical usages and institutions that are singularly adverse to that freedom without which there is no inquiry—and, consequently, to that inquiry without which there is no truth; usages and institutions that are aimed more specifically against the mental freedom of professional teachers of religion,—as if to quench the spirit of truth out of the hearts of the very men who ought to be its special guardians and votaries. There is really a merit in speaking of these things with temper; they are so monstrously inconsistent with the first principles of Christianity, and so fatally mischievous to the highest interests of mankind. When a state church makes a man's bread to depend (or, if not his bread, his professional character and prospects) upon his subscribing one of those catalogues of metaphysico-theological propositions which are called *creeds and articles of faith,* and continuing in the faith so subscribed during the term of his natural or ecclesiastical life, and upon worshipping, or seeming to worship God, by one of those forms of words called *Liturgies,* (which are creeds to all intents and purposes,) which he did not make, which he may not like, which if he liked at one time, in his life, he may dislike at another time, which if it expressed his real feelings at one time, may not express his real feelings at another time, but have become weary, stale, flat, and altogether unprofitable, by frequent repetition—representative to him of nothing but his own moral and spiritual slavery in being so slavish as to take money for worshipping God in a way of other men's choosing,—when state churches, or any churches, do such things as these,—alas! for the spirit of truth, that leadeth into truth. What a machinery for grinding men into hypocrites and cowards! Or when, without a creed *expressed,* (and even it may be with the boastful negation of all creeds,) there is a creed *implied,*—when a church asks a man to lead it into truth with a tacit understanding that there are some truths into which it is not to be led, or some things which, although true, it is not to be asked to recognise as true,—what is to become of the mind of that church? what is to become of the mind of its minister? what is to become of the mind and heart of the man that does the weekly drudgery of dressing up old thoughts in new words, and goes through the weekly humiliation of standing in the place of a Teacher of Truth, in the spirit of a mendicant for 'acceptability?' Oh! if churches did but know the zeal, and heartiness, and enthusiasm, with which they may get themselves served by men whom they do not ask to *serve them* exactly, but to serve with them Truth and the God of Truth,—and if they did but know the deep, scornful indignation, with which some minds revolt against these tyrannical exactions, and the pitiful and pitiable imbecillity which submission generates in other minds—they would be careful how they wield a power which never did truth anything but mischief from the days of the flood downward.

The last influence we shall advert to as adverse to the truthful spirit, is *Sectarianism*; by which I understand the custom or practice (so nearly universal in the Christian world, that one would be apt to take it for the very essence of Christianity, only that when we look at the mind and life Christ we see everything that is unsectarian) of *basing religious fellowship upon a prerequired identity of theological opinion*, marshalling men into little hostile bands badged and ticketed, as it were, to prevent mistakes: so that men come at last to think, feel, reason, and even interpret Scripture, not individually, but in masses. How is intellect to grow, how is affection to become expanded and generous, under such a system as this? Can there be, is there likely to be, a spirit of truth leading into truth, when a man cannot have what is called an out-of-the-way opinion upon a theological question, but he must be cut off and cast out of the synagogue? Is a man likely to think freely and strongly—strong minds may do it—but is it likely, taking the average of minds, that a man will think freely and strongly, who fears that if he think not after the approved standard of orthodoxy, the minister and deacons of his church will be upon him with a domicilary visit of expostulation, or a public sentence of disownment and excision? How few sects there are in this country (none, I suppose, except the establishment and the Unitarians, the former from sheer laxity and carelessness, the latter, it may be hoped, from their better views of the real nature and requisitions of Christianity) that would not think it an actual sin to admit a man to the Lord's Supper without his first avowing a belief, upon the abstrusest points in theology, in accordance with the catalogued opinions of their clergy,—and, (which is immeasurably worse, if worse need be,) unfolding the most secret history of his heart, tearing open the Holy of Holies of his soul, to the gaze of the little oligarchy of the meeting house. What a discipline for the heart, and what a discipline for the intellect! What a way of making a man a Christian! and what a way of making him a theologian! What can this end in, (one is tempted to ask,) but a dull stationary religion, and an equally dull and stationary theology; weary hearts and feeble minds? That it does not always end thus, is because there is a something in Christianity which the discipline of Christian Churches cannot make quite inoperative, and a something in human nature which that discipline cannot quite extinguish;—and so with all this, sects, and the individuals that constitute sects, do progress, both in religion and theology; just so much as to show what they might do, were religion and theology as free as Christ left them—but so little as also to show that the spirit of truth is not yet come that is to guide men into all truth. It is not necessary to treat at length certain of those more obvious influences of Sectarianism that are hostile to the truth-loving spirit—the jealousies, feuds, partizanships that it generates; for these are palpable enough; besides which they all grow up from one root of bitterness—from making religious fellowship contingent upon coincidence of opinion. Why should anything be deemed essential to a church, beyond a practical matter-of-fact agreement on the part of its members, to join in the same worship and hear the same preaching? Of course, so long as worship is conducted by oral addresses to the Supreme Being, this presupposes an agreement, expressed or implied, as to the Being or Beings to whom the worship shall be addressed: and there must also be an agreement, (an agreement of feeling, however—not of speculation—not of a kind that need or very well can be embodied in words,)—there must be a general, practical agreement as to the spirit in which worship shall be offered; whether, for instance, in a Jewish or a Christian spirit, whether in prostrate, agonized terror, or in the faith and love of Sonship. And consequently, until some mode of social worship can be devised to supersede the exceedingly imperfect machinery of language, there must be, and will be, separate associations for public prayer, with different, though frequently varying, external forms. And as regards instruction and moral exhortation—the other great object of social religious organization—there must, of course, be a concurrence on the part of the majority as to the general suitability of the professional teacher (if there be a professional teacher) to their intellectual and moral wants; but this suitability does not depend upon theological opinion, only or chiefly,—it is compounded of many elements of which theology is nearly the least in importance. But why go further than this, in founding or governing a church? Why look for any other bond of union than that *general similarity of taste and feeling*, which cannot be expressed very well in words, which can be perfectly well understood without words, which is best evidenced by the *simple fact of men's habitually worshipping together*. Why make it a difficult or dangerous, or even a disagreeable thing, for a preacher to give utterance to an opinion different from the opinions of some or all of his hearers; or for a hearer to dissent, and avow his dissent, from the opinions of a minister and body of elders? What can be more opposed to the spirit of truth that leadeth into all truth—a spirit which, in order to lead into all truth, must be a spirit of inquiry and progression, and of that kind of change which is implied in progression—the change, that is not of oscillation, but of expansion and onward movement—what can be more opposed to this spirit, than the dead, dull, heavy, mechanical fixity of creeds and creed-bound sects?

Truly, there is a Reform wanted here: the world does want a real, searching, thorough Church-Reform:—by which we do not mean so small and poor a thing as an equalizing of episcopal revenues, or a doing away with Church-Rates, or an extrusion of spiritual barons from the Legislature—(all very excellent things so far as they go, and so far as they touch great and true principles, but, all of them, things perfectly compatible with the continued working of that Leaven of the Pharisees which is hypocrisy and intolerance) nor do we mean merely a reform in men's mode of conceiving of what are called the "Doctrines of Christianity"—a move in the direction of theological Rationality—the popular or fashionable adoption of creeds that do not quite wear the appearance of having been drawn up on purpose to burlesque religion; we do not mean merely the desuetude of Athanasian Creeds, or even a legislative Unitarianizing of the Liturgy. It is quite conceivable that all this, and more than all this, should come to pass, that the relation of the Church to the State should be again what it was before the proselytism of Constantine, and that Unitarianism should become orthodox, or orthodoxy become Unitarianism,—and yet, with all this, that Theology should still be enslaved, and Religion dishonoured and debased. An unendowed Church may be to the full as antichristian as an endowed Church; and there may be as much of a timid, time-serving, drowsy Finality in a sect that worships one God in one person, as in the sects that worship one God in three persons. It is quite another sort of Church-Reform than this, that the world wants: we want a Reform, a re-forming, a forming over again, an unmaking and remaking, a destruction and reconstruction, of our very conceptions of the nature of a church and of the principles and objects of church-union; such a reform as shall (we do not say place this or that system of theology, or this or that form of religion, in the ascendant,—but) place Theology itself in the ascendant as the first of sciences, and place Religion itself in the ascendant as the first of moral forces, the chief motive power of human action and affection; bringing both theology and religion under the tutelage of that Spirit of truth and truthfulness, which will make the one as simply rational and the other as purely spiritual as the limitations of our intellectual and moral powers will allow. We want such a Church-Reform as shall make the Church of Christ, or fellowship of Christian and Christlike men, the Friend of human hearts and minds, the advocate of all human interests, the salt of the earth, the light of the world, a living fountain, whose waters fail not, of whatsoever things are true, venerable, just, lovely, virtuous and of good report.—And what a glorious thing the church would be, how strong, how pure, how heavenlike, how fitly framed together, what a holy temple in the Lord, what a habitation of God through the spirit, what an asylum for sad hearts and doubting minds, what a nursery for great souls, what a symbol of nature's kind maternity—what a glorious thing the church would be that should away with the jargon of sects and the cant of creeds, and trust Christ's promise, and appropriate Christ's Legacy, and make the Spirit of Truth the life and breath of its being! What a rock to build a church upon is Truth! What a bond to knit men together is the Love of Truth! What a principle of conservation, and what a principle of progression (those two interests which are just now rending the world in halves, because men will take them separately instead of together)—what a principle both of conservation and of progression, is the worship of Truth; the union of man with man, to learn and to teach the realities of God!

Where this Church-Reform is to come from, when it is to come, what are to be the signs of its coming—are questions which he must be a bold man who would undertake to meet with a precise and conclusive answer. A proximate solution is all that the nature of the problem admits of. The kingdom of God cometh not with observation; and he who reads the signs of the times most discerningly will usually be the least hasty with his exclamations of 'lo here,' and 'lo there.' We may say, perhaps, in general, with little risk of error, that this new Protestant and Christian Reformation will come as gradually as it will surely; for it is thus that nature usually works, and it is nature that we have to look to here, far more than institution and enactment. Its future history will present, probably, the same essential features with its past history—seeming and partial oscillations together with real progression; though there are circumstances characteristic of the times we live in, which may justify the hope that the oscillations will be less frequent and take place within ever-narrowing limits, while the progression becomes increasingly decided and discernible; indeed even now, one almost fancies sometimes that it is visible to the naked eye:—with infinite obstructions of circumstance against it, it cannot be expected to move otherwise than very slowly; with the great eternal laws of the moral universe for it, its movement must be, on the whole, onward and progressive: in short, it will present most of the phenomena usually incident to motion that is measurable, not by the little arithmetic of months and years, but by the great moral cycles of providence. It will come, we should suppose, not from vast sectarian organizations, not from aggregate sectarian meetings, not from well-drilled armies (even of the "friends of truth and free inquiry"), marshalled under sectarian leaders and fighting under sectarian banners—it will neither be extemporized nor mechanized; perhaps it may not come, with exclusive speciality, from the bosom of any one sect of Christendom: it will rather be the work of individuals of many sects (or, possibly, disowned by all sects), feeling, intensely and profoundly, the world's need of a new development of Christianity, and putting forth with full purpose of heart whatever power is in them, by nature and circumstance, to meet and satisfy the need. And there is quite enough in the present state of public feeling, and (which is of much more consequence) in its tendencies—to all appearance, its settled and growing tendencies—there is quite enough here, to stimulate and cheer forward every effort made in the direction of a real religious freedom. Such efforts will be abundantly reinforced by that all-pervading restlessness of intellect, that incessant running to and fro in quest of the true and good, which is one characteristic of our time,—and by that growing popular enlightenment which is another; that advancing education of the public mind and heart, which, if it advance much more slowly than its friends could desire, is also advancing very much more rapidly than is at all agreeable to its enemies. The tendencies to a wide and ever-widening spiritual freedom are as deeply fixed, in the mind of this nation, as the old landmarks of opinion are fixed in its ecclesiastical institutions: and the very attempts that are now being made with so much sound and fury, and so small practical significance, to cause those landmarks to be better respected, only show how far the world has drifted, and how fast it is drifting, away from them. This is not an age in which schemes for sectarianizing and churchifying mankind are likely to be widely or lastingly successful.

Meanwhile true and free men have something a great deal better to do than either to glorify themselves, giving thanks to God that they are not as others—or to cower before the spectres of intolerance that yet haunt the church, and would, if they could, frighten the world from its propriety. Whatever others do, or leave undone, they must be true to truth and to the God of Truth, cherishing the spirit of truth in their heart of hearts, following all its leadings in thought, speech and act, seeking for themselves, and giving out to the world a free, generous Christlike Christianity, strengthening with heart and hand every institution and social movement that has for its aim man's moral and social regeneration,—working with the strength of hope, and waiting in the quietness of faith, for brighter and fuller revelations of that glory of the Lord which shall, at the last, be so revealed that all flesh shall see it together.

P. H.

Art. IV.—HEINE.

Of those who have attacked Christianity and advocated Materialism, perhaps no one is more frank and unreserved than Heine. He casts aside all subterfuges—he tears the veil from all disguises—and declares it to be his opinion—that Christianity is a cruel attack upon all the joys dear to man, teaching him a species of self-suicide—namely, to deny to himself all the pleasures and delights of life, in exchange for present misery and a future dream.

Above all, *reformed* Christianity is the object of his passionate reproaches—for the Catholic Church he has more indulgence, in it, he perceives some faint reflection of the gorgeous, sensual religion of the pagan world, the flowers, the lights, the pœans, the processions, the dances before Baal. The joys of the flesh are, in its ceremonies, not altogether lost,—while, in the purity of the reformed religion—in its dispensation of the Gospel of Christ, his imagination can discern no image, but that of one—who snatches away bread, and gives a stone.

The luxurious banquets—the promiscuous sullied loves, the wreaths of roses—the flowing cups of the antique world, for him are all in all.

Such is the material philosophy of his school. Self denial is considered but as an idle sacrifice—Marriage a fantastical chain—Duty a word without meaning—Death only death—and God only the universe.

Such philosophy, though not perhaps so completely stripped of all its disguises, but insinuating itself under various plausible forms, is sapping at the very foundations of actual society. A few reflections which presented themselves on reading Heine's book may be worth the attempt to preserve.

The great reproach made by the philosophers of this school against Christiaruty, is its Ascetecism. The struggle of mind against matter which it maintains, is declared to be a painful and vain sacrifice of the substantial to the ideal; of realities to illusions. Its temperance, a stupid rejection of luxury and pleasure—its modesty a barbarous enmity to art and beauty—its marriage tie a cruel, useless restriction, in the worlds of love and delight—in short, the whole system one relentless war against human happiness, which these philosophers appear to think, consists in human *pleasure*.

No doubt the ascetic self denials, imposed by many Christian professors under the various forms of its different churches, have, not unfrequently, been founded in error. The error lay in this, that the infliction was *useless*—for though we are far from thinking that *utility*, strictly so called, is the measure by which to try enjoyment—it is the only just measure by which to try *infliction*. All useless pain, useless privation—that is pain, or privation, tending to no ultimate end—is *positive evil*—while enjoyment is an end in itself,—a positive good—and even when tending to no further end and aim, an object worthy of every wise and good man's care.

Pain inflicted without reference to an aim, is cruelty and wrong—and so far as the doctrine of the merit of suffering, or ascetecism, is open to this reproach, it is worthy of the contempt and reprobation of these votaries of joy. But such is not the doctrine of Christ.

Because *useless* pain—and *useless* self denial are to be deprecated—is there no such thing as pain and self denial which have their uses? And shall that man be deemed an illusionist and a fool, who girds up his soul as the soldier of Christ—to voluntary suffering in that great fight? not useless suffering, not useless privation—but privation and suffering for an object and an end.

This is the principle of the Christian Religion and the foundation of its morality—*suffering for love*—Christ dying on the cross, *for the sake of others*, its grand symbol.

If our own happiness is the sole rational aim of being, our own enjoyment the sole end of life—what may we not become? —why not a Nero or a Commodus. Who ever advances twenty-four hours in the course of life, without perceiving the occasion arise, in which by making some sacrifice of his own satisfactions, he may promote the satisfactions of others. And what does Christian love mean—or what does Christianity require other than this—that a man should not alone regard the things of his own, but the things of others? What does the word duty —duties of masters, parents, governors, servants, subjects, children, mean, but that each shall be ready, as occasion requires, to sacrifice of his own advantages or enjoyments, for the advantage and enjoyment of his fellow creatures?

Christianity was intended to protect the weak, the sick, the ignorant, the poor, and the helpless in this world, against the oppressions of the strong, the healthy, the joyous, the able and the rich. Its divine philosophy does not aim at diminishing the sum of human enjoyment, but at equalizing its several portions. Let him that hath, give to him that hath not. Let

Dives in his purple robe, and at his sumptuous feast, bethink him of the Lazarus that lieth at his gate. Let the woman and the child be considered too. Let the woman who has given herself to man, be to him for ever—his treasure, his protected one—let him "*honour her as the weaker vessel*"—divine and beautiful thought—let her not be the companion merely of his idle moments—let her be the partner of his heart and of his soul. Let the children they have mutually called into being, be the objects of that mutual care, without which the intellectual being called into existence can neither enjoy his best happiness, nor reach his highest standard. Let calm, sacred, composed conjugal love—constant and tranquil—a love that sweetens but does not absorb life, succeed to short but vehement bursts of pleasure, every outbreak of which serves but to obscure the intellectual being. Let the altered situation in respect to society in which Christian women find themselves superior to that of women in any other society which has ever existed, not even excluding the matrons of Rome, or the Virgins of Sparta, declare to them, whether for the *weak* at least, the doctrine of parity taught by the Christian religion, be an evil or a good. Heine says, and says it as a reproach, speaking of the reformation in Germany—"La lutte contre le catholicisme en Allemagne, ne fut qu' une lutte entreprise par le spiritualisme lorsqu'il entrevit, qu'il n'avoit que le titre du pouvoir, quand il s'aperçut qu'il ne regnait que *de jure*, tandis que le sensualisme s'etait sourdement emparé sous main de la domination réelle et gouvernait *de facto*. Les porteurs d'indulgences furent chassés; les belles *concubines des prêtres* furent remplacées par des femmes ligitimes; les seduisantes images de Madones furent brisées et une veritable puritanisme prit possession du pays." As if it were a diminution of human enjoyment—an inroad upon human happiness, to substitute the sweetness of domestic love, for the licentiousness of priestly amours—or the purity of divine love, for the mixed, sensual and idolatrous feelings excited by the worship of the Virgin.

In judging of the real value of Christianity, we must examine two things never sufficiently sounded to the bottom.

What does it really enjoin—and what are the ends of those things which it really forbids?

We must not confound its injunctions with the injunctions of those who usurp its name to impose their own laws. We must not confine its glorious liberty with the cobweb fetters of a Sir Andrew Agnew—of those who forbid any of the *innocent* enjoyments of life. Christianity expressly declares that it forbids *nothing* which is innocent—and it defines what is *not innocent*—whatsoever retards our own moral and spiritual advancement—whatsoever causes a weak brother to offend—whatsoever injures another—that is, diminishes his means of enjoyment to enhance our own—whatsoever limits our powers of promoting the good of others—that ceases to be innocent—for we are to do all things in love. We are not to consider that as innocent, which happens not to hurt our own body and soul—if it injure the most insignificant, or is a snare to the most ignorant, it is innocent no more—we are to love the brethren, and devote ourselves to that good cause, the advancement of human virtue and happiness—and God will reward us in another world.

For do what these philosophers will, and say what they will—Death there must be—and such a position will present itself in human affairs as this—where a man may produce a positive increase of happiness to his fellow creatures, by the sacrifice of his own life—a position which denies the possibility of virtue being its own reward. Christ, who is no ascetic, no romancer, declares that of such as heed not themselves, their creator will take heed, and will recompense to every one his sacrifices done in love—yet placing the reward in that dim region of which we have so faint and doubtful a glimmering, he provides for the growth of that loveliest fruit of human development, disinterested benevolence.

And what would Heine substitute for this? A world where pleasure—sensual pleasure—positive pleasure of the senses, is to be the supreme good—sensual passionate love—magnificence, luxury, the summum bonum—and the peace of God which passeth all understanding, to be despised as an idle dream. But he should consider that thus Satan lies at the root of all sensual pleasures—*all* cannot enjoy them. The ineffable gifts of God are like the common air, the wide spread heavens free and open to all—" Ho, every one that thirsteth come ye to the waters; and he that hath no money, come ye buy and eat, come buy wine and milk, without money and without price."

Not so of the goods of this world, all cannot possess them—luxury and magnificence must be obtained by the sacrifice of some to others—if I lie on down—and revel in the luxuries of life, some one must labour for me. There is a taint of injustice in all *mere* pleasure—but moderation, temperance, equable passions, universal love, and the peace of God, are from that living and exhaustless fountain—and if Heine says the water after all is not worth drinking, let him open his eyes and see for himself—let him see that pleasure terminates in satiety, and virtuous exertion terminates in rest—and that the votaries of pleasure shoot themselves on beds of down—and that the disciples of Christ possess their souls upon the bed of anguish, and amid the flames of the stake—and let him understand a little of what human nature is composed and then teach—and let him learn by examination of facts, that man *is* a spiritual and a moral being—and that a spiritual and a moral being can no more be made happy by mere animal pleasures, than an animal could be made happy by mere vegetable pleasures—and that you may as well attempt to make the soaring eagle happy planted on one spot like the oak tree—as to make man happy without the excursive employment of his higher faculties,—and he may, perhaps, begin to suspect, that Jesus of Nazareth was a little better philosopher, than he has been apt to fancy.

M.

Art. V.—A DISCOURSE ON THE LATEST FORM OF INFIDELITY. By Andrews Norton. Cambridge: Published by John Owen. 1839.

"*The latest Form of Infidelity" examined.* A letter to Mr. Andrews Norton, occasioned by his "Discourse before the Association of the Alumni of the Cambridge Theological School" on the 19th July, 1839, by an Alumnus of that School. Boston: James Monroe & Co. 1839.

Hegel, to express his own views upon religion, quotes from Herr von Baden the following sentiments: "Until we obtain for religion and its doctrines an esteem founded upon a free and scientific inquiry, and in consequence sincere belief—so long be you pious or not pious, whatever you command or forbid, whatever you say or do, you will not remove the evil,—and so long will this despised religion not be loved, because men can only heartily and sincerely love, what they see sincerely esteemed, and feel to be undoubtedly estimable, and religion can be served alone by such an *amor generosus.* In other words, do you wish that the *Praxis* of Religion should again flourish, take care then to attain to a reasonable *theorie* of it, and do not entirely abandon the field to your adversaries (the Atheists) with that unreasonable and blasphemous assertion—that such a theory of religion, as an impossible thing, should not be thought of, and that religion is a mere affair of the heart, in which we can, nay must, dispense with the *head.*"*

The truth of these sentiments is felt with an ever increasing force by every party of religionists amongst us, but the form in which their conviction manifests itself differs according to the previous circumstances in which they have been placed.—The Catholic who has so long relied on authority feels within his own breast, that he needs some other foundation on which to build, if he would add to his assent to religion the ardent glow of a generous love—and in Rome itself a Catholic Priest gives "Lectures on the Connexion of Science and Revealed Religion:" as might be expected from their talented Author, Dr. Wiseman, they do infinite credit at once to his head and heart—but as Schiller has remarked of the Catholic Church, though on a very different occasion, "It was an unhappy thought to bring the enlightening torch of the understanding so near to the mysteries of the church and to fight with syllogisms for the objects of blind faith."*

---

* Encyclopædie der Philosophischen Wessenschaften Ein Grund risz von Dr. G. W. F. Hegel, 1827. Vorrede zum zweiten Ausgabe.

The Church of England on the contrary found men growing impatient under the use of a reason they were yet condemned to tether, lest it should permit them to range without the prescribed bounds of the Rubric. Some of her members have therefore endeavoured to rekindle an affectionate attachment to the ancient Fathers, that they who cannot compel their reason to certain conclusions, may yet receive them with childlike reverence from the early martyrs and confessors of our faith. Nor is the appeal made at present in vain, however it may subsequently prove that " the Oxford School are most ably fighting the battles of Unitarianism, that is of Reason, in connection with Religion; and when they have dispossessed the Evangelical Church and the Orthodox Dissenters of their present untenable position, they will only have proved that there is no legitimate Protestantism except in the direction of Rationalism, of individual liberty, and *safety* of opinion."†

The Protestant Churches of Germany have perhaps participated most deeply and most consciously in this desire to reproduce Christianity in a form suited to the wants of the present age; accustomed as they have been to appeal chiefly to the inward sentiments of religion, and to address the feelings rather than the understanding, they have now resorted to reason, and first a *natural*, and then a *mythical*, explanation of the Life of Christ has been the result.—But, whatever be the solution given, it will ever remain an honour to Germany, that as her land gave birth to Luther, so her consecrated ground is still the arena of a full, free, and scientific, inquiry into the true foundations of religious faith.

It cannot be expected that our own body, accustomed as we have always been to carry out our principles, and assert the rights of reason, should remain inactive at a period which has roused even the rear guards of Society, nor have we failed to be ready at the call of duty. But as each party in case of unexpected and unprepared for attack seizes new and untried weapons, hoping to add force by adding novelty to its arguments, and appears to attach for a time an unnatural importance to what are in fact outposts to its main tower of strength, as the Church of Rome has made its appeal to Science, and the Church of England to the Fathers, as the Germans have resorted to Reason, so have we to miracles; and there has sprung up a novel doctrine amongst us, that a belief in the miraculous facts of Christ's mission is what properly constitutes a belief in Christianity. The Rev. J. Martineau speaking concerning the efforts of the Antisupernaturalists thus continues : *—

---

* Geschichte des Abfalls der vereinigten Niederlande Carlruhe, 1823, p. 201.

† Oxford School of Theology, p. 6, *Christian Teacher*, January, 1840.

> " But should these attempts to reduce the facts of the evangelical history to common events be successful, the Gospel falls ; nor is there any intelligible sense in which any one who thinks the supernatural may be thus banished from the birth and infancy of our faith can continue to take the name of Christian. Neither the first principle, then, of the German Rationalists, that reason must judge of the contents as well as the outward structure of Revelation ; nor their secondary rule, that the resources of natural causation must be exhausted before recourse is had to the preternatural, in the explanation of historical phenomena, can be proved unsound. But they are exposed to just animadversion, for having preferred, by convulsive efforts of interpretation, to compress the memoirs of Christ and his Apostles into the dimensions of ordinary life, rather than admit the operation of miracle on the one hand, or proclaim their abandonment of Christianity on the other."

The following remark is quoted from a note appended to this statement :—

> " If indeed the *essential features* of Christianity are to be found in the doctrinal or preceptive parts of the Scripture, it is difficult to deny to any one who holds the doctrines and venerates the precepts he finds there, the title of Christian ; and it is only on the supposition of the religion of Christ being *essentially historical,* that we can make a belief in *the facts* the basis of our definition."

The Rev. Dr. Hutton in his discourse on " Miracles essential to the proof of a divine Commission," advocates the doctrine that supernatural works are the *only* decisive proof of a divine mission thus :—

> " Those who profess to be God's ambassadors, and bring with them no better or more satisfactory credentials than their own assertion to that effect, Jesus himself being the judge, deserve not to be credited. He made his appeal therefore not only to the testimony of his great forerunner, whose prophetic mission his Jewish hearers were willing to concede, but also to what he regarded as *alone* decisive, the testimony of God Himself, in those miraculous works which he enabled him to perform, and in that supernatural attestation which he gave to his Messiahship at his baptism."—(p. 10.)

After an admirable comment on that passage in St. John's Gospel, 5th chap. 32 to 38 verses, the Author continues :—

> " We have our Lord himself then explicitly declaring that his own assertion of his divine mission neither could nor ought to be regarded as a sufficient proof of it by any *reasonable* mind. He warrants us for calling for a stronger and better evidence, and he further intimates that

---

* The Rationale of Religious Inquiry, by James Martineau, pp. 132—146.

such evidence to be satisfactory, must be of a superhuman character—must be the direct evidence of God himself. ' I receive not testimony from man, I appeal to the witness of the Father.' By miracles, and by miracles alone, did he think that his prophetic character, his divine mission, properly so called, could be established."—(p. 11.)

But of the singular charity which characterizes the judgments of this writer concerning his fellow-men, we have a marked specimen in the following words, where he speaks of those who reject the testimony which he believes Jesus himself regarded as alone decisive, in the following manner :—

> "The internal evidence, I have observed, might be sufficient for minds of a higher order than our own, for minds capable of estimating the exact powers of the human intellect, and determining the precise point beyond which it could not advance without Divine aid. Let me add that even to us, as we advance in knowledge and virtue, the internal evidence will prove a growing quantity. In proportion to the increased purity of our moral taste, and acuteness of our moral discernment, will be our growing conviction of the beauty and excellence of the character of Christ, and of the moral system he taught; and the time may come, if to some of us it has not already arrived, when these *alone* may suffice to convince us that He and his doctrine were of God."—(p. 31.)

We find also that Professor Norton, whose theological acumen has given him so high a rank among our controversial writers, has given the sanction of his approbation to this view, and in the Discourse entitled " the latest form of Infidelity," the doctrine, that the miracles recorded in the new Testament are the *only* proof of the divine origin of Christianity is most clearly laid down. The author says (p. 5)—

> " By a belief in Christianity we mean the belief that Christianity is a revelation by God of the truths of religion; and that the divine authority of him whom God commissioned to speak to us in his name was attested, in the *only* mode in which it could be, by miraculous displays of his power."

And (p. 21) we read,—

> " If it were not for an abuse of language that has prevailed, it would be idle to say, that in denying the miracles of Christianity, the truth of Christianity is denied. It has been vaguely alleged, that the internal evidences of our religion are sufficient, and that miraculous proof is not wanted; but this can be said by no one who understands what Christianity is, and what its internal evidences are. On this ground however, the miracles of Christ were not indeed expressly denied, but were represented by some of the founders of the modern school of German infidelity as only prodigies, adapted to rouse the attention of a rude people, like the Jews; but not required for the conviction of men of more enlightened minds. By others the accounts in the Gospels have been admitted as in the main true, but explained as only exaggerated and discoloured relations of natural events. But now without taking the trouble to go

through this tedious and hopeless process of misinterpretation, there are many who avow their disbelief of all that is miraculous in Christianity, and still affect to call themselves Christians. But Christianity was a revelation from God; and, in being so, it was itself a miracle. Christ was commissioned by God to speak to us in his name; and this was a miracle. No proof of his divine commission could be afforded, but through miraculous displays of God's power. Nothing is left that can be called Christianity, if its miraculous character be denied. Its essence is gone, its evidence is annihilated. Its truths, involving the highest interests of man, the facts which it makes known, and which is implied in its very existence as a divine revelation, rest no longer on the authority of God. All the evidence, if evidence it can be called, which it affords of its doctrines, consists in the real or pretended assertions of an individual of whom we know very little, except that his history must have been most grossly misrepresented."

We find (p. 36) the following judgment pronounced:—

"Of the form of infidelity which we have been considering, there can be but one opinion among honest men.—Great moral offences in individuals are, indeed, commonly connected with the peculiar character of their age, and with a prevailing want of moral sentiment in regard to such offences, in the community in which they are committed. This may be pleaded in excuse for the individual, but the essential character of the offence remains. It is a truth, which few among us will question, that, for any one to pretend to be a Christian teacher, who disbelieves the divine origin and authority of Christianity, and would undermine the belief of others, is treachery towards God and man. If I were to address such a one, I would implore him by all his remaining self-respect, by his sense of common honesty, by his regard to the well-being of his fellow-men, by his fear of God, if he believe that there is a God, and by the awful realities of the future world, to stop short in his course; and, if he cannot become a Christian, to cease to be a pretended Christian teacher, and to assume his proper character."

The letter addressed to Professor Norton is as might be expected, a reply to the charges brought forward in the discourse, and to the exclusive principle which it advocates; and first the author judiciously commences by proving the incompatibility of any test of religious faith, with Christian freedom: he thus expresses himself:—

"By the exclusive principle, I mean the assumption of the right for an individual or any body of individuals to make their own private opinions the measure of what is fundamental in the Christian faith. As liberal Christians we have long contended against this principle, as contrary to the very essence of Protestantism; we have claimed the inherent right of private judgment as essential to Christian freedom; we have resisted to the uttermost every attempt to impose controverted points of opinion on the universal belief of the Church. We have welcomed every man as a brother, who acknowledged Christ as his Master; we have not presumed to sit in judgment on any Christian's claim to discipleship; we have refused to entertain the question, whether he were entitled to the Christian name; we have felt it was not ours to give or to withhold; and that the decision in all cases must rest with himself.—It was not because our exclusive brethren made a belief in the Trinity, a test of allegiance to Christ, that we accused them of inconsistency with the Liberty of the Gospel; but because they presumed to erect any standard whatever, according to which the faith of individuals should be made to conform to the judgment of others. It was not any special application of the principle, that we objected to; it was the principle itself; and assuredly, the exercise of this principle does not change its character, by reason of the source from which it proceeds. Nay, is it not aggravated by the fact, that it is sustained, not by those with whom it forms a part of their religion, but by those whose religion is identified with hostility to it?

"But the doctrine which lies at the foundation of your whole discourse is a signal manifestation of the exclusive principle. You propose your own convictions,—and convictions, which it will appear in the sequel of this letter, are directly at war with the prevailing faith of the Church, —as the criterion of genuine Christian belief."—"You make no allowance for the immeasurable variety of mind which is found everywhere, for the different direction which early education, natural temperament, and peculiar associations impart to men's habits of thinking, for the shifting lights which the same evidence presents, according to the circumstances in which it arrests the attention, or for the changes acquired by language—and the ideas which it conveys, in the progress of ages; but you advance your principle, with the same want of reserve or qualification that a teacher of the Infallible Church would have exhibited before the Reformation; you declare that a certain kind of evidence, in your view, establishes the truth of Christianity, and that he who rests his faith on any other is an infidel, notwithstanding his earnest and open professions to the contrary. You thus, in fact, denied the name of Christian to not a few individuals in your audience, although you avoid discussing the grounds by which their opinions are supported. For it is perfectly well known that many of our most eminent clergymen,—I will not refrain from speaking of them as they deserve, on account of my personal sympathy with their views,—repose their belief in the divine origin of Christians on a different foundation from that which you approve as the only tenable one. Men whose names are almost a passport to the opinions they adopt, whose lives are a guarantee against all suspicion of guile, whose fervent devotion to every cause that promises the extension of religion or the good of man has become proverbial, whose candour and transparency of character is a constant memorial of the simplicity of Christ, are inclined to rest their conviction of the divinity of the Gospel on evidence which commends itself to their minds, although you may pronounce it to be valueless and deceptive. Among those who adopt this view of Christianity are clergymen who have never enjoyed the benefit of your instructions, but whose minds have been kept open to every fresh access of light, as well as their younger brethren who are deeply indebted to your councils and example in the pursuit of truth, and who have obtained from your influence in former years, something of that spirit of freedom for which they are now condemned. But according to the doctrine of your Discourse, their faith in Christianity is either a self-deception or a pretence, the divine glory which they recognise in Christ is a vain chimera; they are disqualified for the office of Christian teachers, their very profession of Christianity is a blot on their characters; it calls in question their intellect or their conscience, or both; they are exhorted to abandon a calling which they have no right to pursue; and since they do not receive your construction of the evidences of Christianity, to declare to the world that they repudiate the Saviour, and regard the glorious Gospel of our blessed God as the invention of man."—(p. 23.)

In illustration of this point we cannot forbear quoting the following, we were so much delighted with the free and manly spirit it breathes, and the confidence with which appeal is made to the acknowledged principle, that real mental freedom not merely permits, but demands, the unrestricted expression of opinion :—

"I know that individuals may have felt alarm at the progress of thought, and on hearing the utterance of novel opinions have somtimes wondered 'whereunto these things would grow.' The great body of our people, however, have never been disturbed. They attach little importance to the outcry either of agitators or alarmists. They have no fear of heresy, where thought is left free. They believe that the discussion of opinions is the best antidote to error. Above all they have an instinctive aversion to the denouncing of a man's character on account of his sober and honest convictions. They judge the tree by its fruits. They have long been taught 'that goodness consists in being good.' It is a doctrine which they approve and one which they will practise. You will find it hard to persuade them, that a doubtful speculation in theology is essential to the character of a Christian, 'that where the pulse of virtue beats in the life, the power of religion is dead at the heart.'"

"I have said, that they do not wish for restrictions on freedom of speech. But this is not all. They desire its actual exercise. They have no respect for the man who hides his thought. They know too well the value of liberty lightly to renounce it, for themselves, or their pastors. They wish for no slaves in the pulpit, for no cowards, or sluggards to stand on the watch-tower and look for light. In the general fermentation of modern times they are aware of the danger of artificial restraints. They know 'that the best way to keep things safe is to give them vent.' With few exceptions this is the universal feeling. I have the strongest confidence in the attachment of our community to the first principles of liberal Christianity. When the question is made concerning those principles almost every man among us, ministers and people, will be found in his place. They may greatly differ in speculative opinions; but when the controversy comes to the right of utterance without fear of denunciation, they are true as steel to this cardinal point."—(p. 159.)

But to return to the more immediate object of inquiry, we find that the Author of the letter states (p. 31) that the doctrine he is about to discuss is whether " the miracles recorded in the New Testament are the *only proof* of the divine origin of Christianity." He first shows that there is no necessary connexion between " a denial of the miracles related in the New Testament, and a denial of the divine origin of Christianity"—because the question in the last instance is, " whether Christianity is a revelation by God of the truths of religion," but in the first proposition the question is " how is that revelation attested," and because we give a negative reply to the former it does not follow that we deny the truth of the latter; and he thus continues :—

> " It will be perceived by every accurate thinker that this statement does not affect the question concerning the reality of the miracles. It does not deny them; it does not bring them under suspicion; it leaves them just where they were before; great problems in the experience of man to be solved by the united aids of history and philosophy. I have already stated, that the evidence by which they are supported, on the whole, appears satisfactory to my mind, though I have no disposition to force my convictions on the minds of others."

We fear it will prove impossible not to weaken the force of the arguments adduced in curtailing them as we are obliged to do, but when possible will give them in the Author's own words. He thus advances his first objection :—

> " 1. The intelligent reader will at once be struck with the boldness, the extravagance, and the novelty of this doctrine. If he has paid the slightest attention to theological enquiries and is acquainted with the manner in which the evidences of Christianity have usually been presented, he will wonder at the radical innovation which you attempt to introduce into a familiar and important topic of Theological science. Heretofore, it has been counted a signal excellence of Christianity, that it was capable of proof by a great variety of evidence. In this respect its adaptation to be a universal religion has been earnestly set forth; its ablest defenders have supported it on the ground that it appealed to a multiplicity of proofs; and its claims to the character of a revelation from God, have been maintained by manifold considerations according to the tendency of the minds to which it was addressed."—(p. 44.)
>
> " Now if I rightly apprehend your doctrine, you maintain that as miracles are the only adequate proofs of a divine revelation, all the other branches of evidence which have usually been relied on, are destitute of independent force, they are good to confirm the probability of miracles; but for nothing else.—You observe (p. 21.) that it has been vaguely alledged that the *internal evidences* of our religion are sufficient; but this can be said by no one who understands what Christianity is, and what

its internal evidences are.' 'The internal evidence of Christianity,' according to your discourse, (p. 25.) consists in this circumstance, namely, that 'the History of Jesus being full of accounts of his miracles, everything in his history, what relates to himself, and what relates to others, is conformed to this fact, and to the conception of him as speaking with authority from God.' The internal evidence therefore, is no proof in itself of the divine authority of Christ; it is reduced to a mere negative element; nothing but a condition for the validity of the external evidence; the Gospel is deprived of all inherent marks of truth and divinity. You thus deny the strength of the arguments by which the faith of a multitude of Christians is sustained; but in so doing, you advance a principle which I will not call 'the latest form of infidelity,' but which is certainly at war with the prevailing faith of Christians in every age of the Church.

"I do not indeed assert that this doctrine of the exclusive validity of miraculous evidence is original with yourself. It may have been advanced by theological innovators in former ages; but it has never gained credit with any considerable portion of the church; and, until it was broached by an eminent Scottish divine of our own day," "it could scarcely be said to have received a public advocacy as a principle of theology." "Dr. Chalmers 'disclaims all support, from what is commonly understood by the internal evidence, consisting of those proofs that Christianity is a dispensation from heaven, which are founded upon the nature of its doctrines and the character of the dispensation itself.'* You assert that no one who 'understood' the subject would rely on this evidence.† Dr. Chalmers, however, tells us, that in this course of reasoning he deviates from 'the general example of those who have written on the Deistical controversy,'‡ and he assigns some plausible arguments in favour of this deviation." "I ought to add in justice to Dr. Chalmers, that, at a subsequent period, he retracted his position. The fallacy and dangerous effects of his doctrine were ably pointed out;§ and in a preface to a new edition to his works, he modifies his statement, as follows,—thus virtually abandoning the whole ground. 'The author is far from asserting the study of the Historical evidence, to be the only channel to a faith in the truth of Christianity. How could he, in the face of the obvious fact, that there are thousands and thousands of Christians, who bear the most undeniable marks of the truth having come home to their understanding, in demonstration of the Spirit and of power? They have an evidence within themselves, which the world knoweth not, even the promised manifestations of the Saviour. This evidence is a sign to them that believe.'"

---

* Chalmers' Works, p. 48.

† Discourse, p. 21.

‡ Works, p. 48.

§ See a judicious criticism of Dr. Chalmers' argument in a valuable treatise entitled "Principles of Christian Evidence illustrated by an examination of arguments subversive of Natural Theology, and the Internal Evidence of Christianity advanced by Dr. T. Chalmers," by Duncan Mears, Professor of Theology in King's College, Aberdeen. It is said that this little volume was the means of convincing Dr. Chalmers of the error of his doctrine.

The Author now advances to the consideration of the historical evidence against this exclusive doctrine having ever received support from the general faith of the Church, and first we find that "the early Christian Apologists" were "so far from regarding miracles as the only proof, that they laid comparatively small stress on their importance." And he thus continues :—

"The following passage from one of our most learned scholars, whose acquaintance with Christian antiquity entitles his statements to great weight, contains the substance of the matter in a small compass. Speaking of Justin Martyr, he observes 'of the evidence from miracles he scarcely takes any notice—perhaps the cause may be traced to the popular belief of the age. The efficacy of incantations and magic forms part of this belief, common alike to Christians and Pagans. Miracles were regarded as of no rare occurrence, and they were supposed to be wrought by magical arts. Christianity then might have the support of miracles, but this support would be regarded as of trifling importance by those who were believers in the reality of charms and sorcery. The miracle might be admitted, but the evidence derived from it could be invalidated by ascribing it to the effects of magic. That the early Fathers and Apologists really felt a difficulty of this kind there can be no doubt. The Jews had set the example by attributing the miracles of our Saviour to a demoniacal agency. That the heathen trod in their steps by ascribing them to magical influences, we gather from a hint Justin himself has incidentally dropped, and Origen expressly affirms it as regards Celsus. Here then was a *grand objection to the evidence from miracles*, and one which the Fathers, who were themselves firm believers in the powers of magic and demoniacal influences, must have found it exceedingly difficult to remove.'* It does not meet the point, to say that this objection was founded on a popular superstition of the primitive ages; it is sufficient that the objection was felt; for, therefore, some other evidence was deemed important; and therefore in fine, the early apologist did not hold to the modern doctrine, that miracles are the only proof of a divine revelation."

"The same view concerning the value of miracles was held by the original founders of the Protestant Church. They express themselves in language which reminds us of the most spiritual writers of a later age, in defence of the testimony addressed to the soul, compared with that adressed to the senses." (p. 53.)

We must however content ourselves with transcribing one passage from Luther.

"The miracles which Christ wrought on the body, are small and almost childish, compared with the high and true miracles, which he constantly performs in the Christian world, by his divine, almighty power. For instance, that Christianity is preserved on the earth against the Devil and all his angels; also against so many tyrants and factions; yea, against our own flesh and blood. The fact that the Gospel remains and improves the human heart,—this is indeed to cast out the devil, to tread on serpents, and speak with tongues, for those visible miracles were merely signs for the ignorant, unbelieving crowd, and for those who were yet to be brought in; but for us who know and believe, what need is there of them? For the Heathen indeed, Christ must needs give external signs, which they could see and take hold of; but Christians must need have far higher signs, compared with which the former are earthly. It was necessary to bring over the ignorant with external miracles, and to throw out such apples and pears to them as to children; but we, on the contrary, should boast of the great miracles, which Christ daily performs in his Church."*

---

* *Christian Examiner*, vol. VII. p. 156; Art. on Justin Martyr, by Alvan Lamson.

In proof of his position the author now appeals to more recent authorities both Unitarian and Trinitarian, and we are furnished with most interesting and valuable extracts from Barrow, Clarke, Dwight, Gerard, Verplanck, Abbott, Buckminster, Thacher, Parker, Channing, and others,—but we cannot quote from any owing to limited space, though each would well repay perusal, but this is the less to be regretted because as the author himself has well observed at the conclusion, it is not authority but argument which must establish sound doctrine. The Author then proceeds to consider the doctrine that miracles are the only evidence of a divine revelation in another point of view.

"2. It is contrary to the clear and express teachings of the Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testament. Whatever importance they attach to the evidence of miracles, in support of the claims of divine messengers—and that is an interesting topic of theological inquiry —they give no sanction to your doctrine, that miracles are the sole and exclusive proof of the interposition of God. They appeal to many other considerations; they advance the principle, that the Almighty has spoken to his children in 'divers manners,' as well as at 'sundry times.'" —(p. 76.)

The Author here makes especial mention of the prophets. We will quote only what he says of one:

"I next refer to the Prophet Jeremiah, he was consecrated from his birth to be the messenger of God; the Lord ordained him a prophet to the nations; he was anointed with the Holy Spirit, so that his soul was filled with a higher strength than his own; the timidity of childhood was overcome; and while the dew of his youth was fresh upon him, he became as an iron pillar and a brazen wall, against the kings and the princes, and the priests of the land. Jer. i. 6. 7. 18. He was so fully conscious of acting under a divine commission, that he not only announced his message with the authority of God, but detected the false pretensions of those who claimed a similar commission without being divinely sent. He was able to separate between the chaff and the wheat, between the dreams of fancy and the words of Jehovah, but he made use of no outward criterion, he presented none himself; he judged the false prophets by the inherent character of their message; he rested his own authority on the same evidence; he wrought no miracle, yet he declared the word of God; and the proof of its divinity was in its effects; the fire which melted the obdurate spirit, the hammer which brake in pieces the rocky heart, were no invention of man, but the work of God. Jer. xxiii. 28. 29.

---

* Luther's Werke (Walch's ed.) vol. xi. p. 1338.

"I need not go through the 'goodly fellowship of the Prophets' for further examples of the fact, that divine messengers were sent, whose mission was not confirmed by the testimony of miracles. Your doctrine would disperse that glorious company, dim the light that crowned their heads, rob their word of the divinity which it claimed, steal away the inspiration which rested on their souls, and reduce them from the sublime distinction of Prophets of Jehovah, to the level of Jewish enthusiasts."

"I will close this part of the discussion with the example of John the Baptist, the forerunner and friend of the Messiah. He was declared by the highest authority to be a prophet, whom no one born of woman could surpass, yet John wrought no miracle. John x. 41. What is your view of the mission of John? Was it from Heaven or of men? If you say from Heaven, you take back your doctrine. If you say of men, you oppose the declaration of Christ."—(p. 81.)

The Author quotes various passages both from St. Paul and Jesus himself, to show that they relied on other evidence than miracles alone; we transcribe the following:

"If the mind of Jesus had ever admitted the idea that miraculous evidence was essential to a confirmation of truth; that nothing but external signs could attest his Divinity; it is plain that he could not have uttered the declaration which follows: 'Every one which is of the truth, heareth my voice.' John xviii. 37. Is there not here an express recognition of the power of the soul to perceive spiritual truth? Is there not a faculty in the spirit of man, when true to its birth of the Spirit of God, to commune with the infinite mind, to behold the Divinity in the manifestations of truth? Hath not man an ear to hear the voice of the Son of God? And without reference to this primary fact in human nature, what rational construction can be put on such language so often uttered by Christ?

"It is unnecessary to multiply examples, in which Jesus refers to the testimony of the soul, with no less confidence than to the evidence of miracles. The distinctness, the power, the earnest conviction with which he does this, in the midst of a sensual and idolatrous age, the calm and clear insight into the invisible nature of man, which he ever displayed, the anticipation of spiritual truth, as the common patrimony of the race, which he cherished when all experience was against him, but which subsequent experience tends to confirm, are, I own, to my mind, among the strongest proofs of his divine mission. They seem to me to reveal the peculiar presence of God in the Spirit of Christ.

They are signs of a divine inspiration, more forcible to me, than a visible sign from Heaven." *—(p. 84.)

The author advances his next argument in these words:

"3. In the third place we find express passages in the Scriptures which prove that miracles are not the only evidence of divine revelation."—(p. 89.)

"Among the counsels which the Hebrew Lawgiver imparts to his people, he takes occasion to speak of the case of a pretended prophet. Many such cases would probably occur. 'If there arise among you a prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign or a wonder (performs a visible miracle), and the sign or the wonder come to pass, thou shalt not hearken unto the words of that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams; if he say, Let us go after other gods which thou hast not known. And that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams shall be put to death, because he hath spoken to turn you away from the Lord your God.' Deut. xiii. 1—5.

"The principle involved in these directions is so evident, that it can scarcely escape the notice of the most inattentive reader. A prophet is supposed to make his appearance among the people of the land, he claims a divine commission from his God, though not from Jehovah; he works a miracle in proof of his claims, he gives a sign and the sign comes to pass; but yet he is to be rejected and put to death. His apparent miracle is to be judged by a higher standard; it is to be brought to the test of the doctrine advanced; that decides it to be false, though it had every external proof in its favour; and to reverse the case, and apply the principle here stated to the evidences of Christianity, it is the divinity of

---

* The following passage from Dr. Hutton's discourse on miracles (p. 28) appears so illustrative of this point, that we are desirous to present it to the reader.

"'If any man will do the will of my Father,' said our Lord, on one occasion, 'he shall know of the doctrine whether it is of God or whether I speak of myself;' thus distinctly admitting, that prior to the promulgation of his religion, there were known and established truths respecting the Deity, His nature, attributes, and will, by their accordance with which the doctrines which he taught might be tested. 'Prove all things and hold fast that which is right,' is the exhortation of our religion;—not even miracles themselves would avail to prove that which is wrong.

"Why do we think ourselves justified in rejecting at once, without any thing that will bear the name of examination, the mythologies of Greece and Rome, or the doctrines of the Shaster and Koran? Obviously, because the internal evidence proves them, at the first glance, to be false and fabulous,—because the light of nature has shown us quite enough of God to convince us, that nothing palpably wicked or absurd could originate with him. Even if it could have been proved to our satisfaction that instead of Mahomet's wisely going to the mountain, the mountain had gone to him, our understandings, however confounded, and confounded in that case they certainly must have been, could not have acquiesced in the divine authority of the Koran. No species of proof could, or ought to convince us, that cruelty, sensuality, or any other species of vice, have the direct sanction and approval of God."

"The internal evidence, therefore, of the truth of the Gospel, I fully admit to be of primary importance. If this were wanting, no body of external proof would be of any avail. It is the perfection of the morality of the Gospel, and of the character of its great Founder, that first attracts attention to it, and induces the admiring reader or hearer to inquire, whether it is really Divine, pre-disposing him, at the same time, to receive the proofs of its Divinity with a candid and favourable mind."

the Christian doctrine, which substantiates the divinity of the Christian miracles."—(p. 90.)

"Again, in the description of the dangers to which his disciples would be exposed in the perilous times that were to succeed his death, Jesus predicts, 'that there shall arise false Christs and false Prophets,' with such specious pretensions, 'that if it were possible they would deceive the very elect.' Matt. xxiv. 24. Now in what manner was the fallacy of their pretensions to be detected? Not by bringing them to the test of miracles. For these they were able to perform, as far as the external appearance was concerned. 'They would shew great signs and wonders.' These would deceive many, for every extraordinary event was thought to indicate a peculiar manifestation of God. But the elect would not be deluded by their pretensions. They who had understood the mind of Christ, who had received the essential spirit of his instructions, would look for a deeper meaning in every alleged divine commission, than was signified by outward wonders; they would make the character of the revelation the test of its truth; and finding no inward signs of divinity would reject its claims.

"Again, the same principle is expressed in the direction of the Apostle Paul to the Galatians, in regard to their treatment of those who were thought to pervert the doctrine of Christ. 'For though an angel from Heaven preach any other Gospel to you than that which we have preached, let him be accursed.' Gal. i. 8. According to the doctrine of your discourse, the preaching of an angel would be a signal proof of a divine revelation. It would be a conspicuous miracle of which no one could stand in doubt. What need, you would say, of further evidence? Not so, Paul. He expressly commands the disciples to receive nothing on the authority of an angel, unless it was approved by a higher standard. A miracle alone in his view was not sufficient, the character of the doctrine must determine the weight of the miracle; the internal evidence of divinity must be added to the external testimony of miracle, or even the latter would lose its force."—(p. 92.)

Some practical objections are now brought forward and illustrated. We quote the statement of them only:

"The doctrine, that miracles are the only evidence of a divine revelation, if generally admitted, would impair the religious influence of the Christian ministry. It would separate the pastor of a church from the sympathies of his people, confine him in a sphere of thought remote from their usual interests, and give an abstract and scholastic character to his services in the pulpit. The great object of his endeavours would be to demonstrate the truth of the Christian history; the weapons of his warfare would be carnal and not spiritual; drawn from grammars, and lexicons, and mouldy traditions, not from the treasures of the human heart." "The minister would rely for success on his skill in argument, rather than on his sympathy with man; on the knowledge he gains within the walls of the University, rather than on the experience which may be learned in the houses of his people. He would trust more to his logical demonstration of the evidences of Christianity, than to the faithful exhibition of Christian truth to the naked human heart. But, I believe, not a wise and experienced pastor can be found, who will not say that, as a general rule, the discussion of the historical evidence is ill adapted to the pulpit, and that the effect of such preaching on society at large, or on the individual conscience, are too minute to be estimated."—(p. 95.)

The author states his second objection thus :

" I object again to your exclusive principle on account of its injurious bearing, on the character of a large portion of the most sincere believers in Christ. We have already seen that pressed to its logical consequences, it denies the Christian name to all who do not receive Christianity in the method which you prescribe. For it is clear that if Christianity be founded *only* on its historical evidence, he, who does not receive it on that evidence, cannot strictly be said to receive it at all. But I will not believe that you intend to enforce this conclusion on the great mass of Christians who differ from you, for whose dullness and ignorance you may find some excuse, although you do not hesitate to apply it to those whose studies and profession ought to have furnished them with better information: Still it is not a ' sweet and pleasant thing ' for an unlearned believer in Christ, to be told that he is building on an imperfect foundation and that the temple of his faith is but ' wood hay and stubble,' though he ' may be saved yet so as by fire.' For at all events, it calls in question either his honesty or his judgment. It implies that he either knows the foundation is bad, and is therefore insincere ; or he does not know it, and he is therefore imposed upon. His integrity can be preserved only at the expense of his insight. He may be deluded ; if not, he is a hypocrite : either supposition is anything but agreeable. I should not like to use such language to a man for whose soul it was my duty to watch."—(p. 99.)

The author then proceeds to show that from this consideration springs " another fatal objection" to this exclusive doctrine: he thus continues—

" It removes Christianity from its strong hold in the common mind, and puts it into the keeping of scholars and antiquaries. I have already hinted at this objection, but it deserves a more particular consideration. It follows as a necessary consequence of your exclusive hypothesis. For if the truth of Christianity rests entirely on the foundation of historical evidence ; if there be nothing in its intrinsic character to commend it to the soul, as the revelation of God ; if the uneducated inquirer must make up his mind, either from his own investigations or the testimony of others, in regard to the subtlest questions of literary criticism, before he can cherish a vital faith in the doctrines of Christ, of course he resigns his opinions to the guidance of the learned. He must give up his birth-right as a man before he can establish his faith as a Christian ; for he cannot enter into such investigations himself ; he has neither the ability, the leisure, nor the apparatus that is requisite ; he must sue at the feet of the scholar, for the light which he needs for the salvation of the soul." "It may appear incredible to many, that you should fully admit this consequence, although it is the inevitable result of your reasonings."

"At all events we shall look in vain for a clearer statement of the opinion objected to, than the following words." "The full comprehension of the character and evidence of Christianity is the result of *studies which are pursued only by few*, and the *many want capacity* or opportunity to satisfy themselves on the subject, by their independent unassisted exertions."—(p. 57.) "It is said, that a *great majority of men are not capable* of investigating for themselves the evidences and character of Christianity, and therefore can have no reasonable foundation for their belief in Christianity. The direct answer is, that *trust in the information, judgment, and integrity of others* to a greater or less extent, as it is a universal and necessary, is also a rational principle of belief."—(p. 63.)

"The great majority of people accordingly, having no power to perceive the intrinsic divinity of Christian truth, to behold the glory of God in the character of Christ, are doomed by the very nature of the case, to dependence on the learned class, for the foundation of their faith.

"The first astonishing circumstance connected with this declaration is, that it was addressed to a body of Christians, whose prominent characteristic is the defence of freedom of mind,—of not only the right but the duty, and of course, the power of private judgment, to the most unlimited extent. We have claimed to be the very Protestants of the Protestants; our watchword has been 'The people and not the priests.' We have taken our stand on the broad foundation of the universal mind; we have fought for the inherent privileges of humanity; and if we have in any degree secured a hold on the affections of the community; if the term 'liberal Christian' is sacred and dear to any hearts among the breathing multitudes around us; it is because we have discarded the lifeless formulas of the schools; because we have sought to make Christianity a vital sentiment, instead of a barren tradition; because we have endeavoured to bring the Bible out of the 'dusty corners' in which learned speculations had placed it; and boldly appealed to the sense of truth in every man, to *see* and *judge* for himself what is right."—(p. 106.)

In conclusion, we desire to offer some remarks on that definition of the term Christian, which is founded on a belief in the facts recorded in the Gospel History. It performs, indeed, its alleged good office of excluding the Antisupernaturalists, but when this is done, it leaves the question as open as ever to discussion: for instance, does not the Trinitarian maintain that the miraculous birth of Jesus is an *essential* historical fact, and the Unitarian deny this?—and who shall decide this point;—will not the Trinitarian continue to unchristianize us as usual;—or will our new definition, formed to exclude others, teach him more charity than our older and more liberal one had ever done?

There is another objection lately brought forward against allowing the Antisupernaturalists the Christian name, which is, that the very meaning of the word Christ, *Messiah*, or the Anointed One, being the name of an office, not a person, renders it unsuitable to derive an appellation from it for one who denies the miraculous, though he may properly be regarded as a follower of Jesus. But this seems fallacious reasoning; there was nothing whatever miraculous in itself in anointing among the Jews. It was not supposed to have even as much efficacy as is now attributed to the oil used in the Bishop's ordination service. In former times it was perhaps imagined that anointing gave to kings a right divine; but since the days of Milton, our Iconoclast, surely none attach any divine efficacy to this rite, but still we find majesty is at least as firmly seated on her throne as in the days of king Charles the Martyr. It might perhaps seem easy to define a Christian one who takes Christ to be his supreme and only guide, but then we might possibly even in this entrench upon the ground of our Swedenborgian brethren who believe in the miraculous power, and inspiration of their founder.

We can find then no middle point between exclusively appropriating the Christian name, to exactly that view of Christianity which we deem correct, and hold ourselves responsible for as our own;—and permitting each one who retains the Christian name to be himself the judge of his own right to assume it. And even if we do not rest satisfied with Dr. Johnson's definition of a Christian, that he is "a professor of the religion of Christ"—but joining in the present demand for more accurate analysis agree with Dr. Webster,—that a Christian means, 1st. a believer in the religion of Christ,—let us not overlook his next and equally satisfactory definition, viz. 2, a professor of his belief in the religion of Christ. And then in a truly fraternal spirit would we desire to join in that beautiful prayer of the Church of England, that "all who profess and call themselves Christians, may be led into the way of truth, and hold the faith in the unity of the Spirit, in the bond of peace and righteousness of life."

C. L.

Art. VI.—SOCIALISM.

The Religion of Jesus Christ, defended from the Assaults of Owenism. By J. R. Beard.
Lectures on Socialism. By John Eustace Giles.
Socialism as it is—Lectures in reply to Mr. Giles. By Joshua Hobson.
Owen's Book of the New Moral World.

We have too long delayed to notice these Works, especially the first, which for reasons with which the Readers of this Magazine must be well acquainted, as well as on account of its own intrinsic value and importance, should have had earlier place in our List of Books reviewed. Our delay has arisen, however, from no disinclination to call attention to these Works, but from a strong distaste for a discussion hitherto so sadly mixed up with passion and prejudice, with ignorance and misconception. From the first appearance of Socialism in a fixed and popular form in this country, we have recognised elements of Truth and of Utility in it, which we ventured most confidently to hope would ultimately prevail over the strange mass of falsehood and of mischief with which they had been so unhappily allied. It seemed to us that in the full and furious attack with which it was assailed from almost all quarters, as well as in the violent and undiscriminating defences with which it was maintained, there was by both parties almost as much truth trampled upon, as error combated. We could not give ourselves up with perfect sympathy to either party. While Socialism scorned and rejected Truths, which we deemed among the most fundamental, and the most holy of our nature, orthodoxy we could not but perceive too frequently attacked positions that were unassailable, and defended positions that were untenable. In addition to this, neither party confined its attention sufficiently to the principles of the other, but dwelt upon consequences which it was supposed had resulted, or would result from these principles. To these consequences as stated by each other, both parties demurred, and both therefore remained unaffected by the arguments advanced.

Owenism consists of certain principles, and certain deductions from them, which last alone are properly speaking Socialism. The *principles* are these: I. That man is the creature of circumstances. II. That, therefore, to make man virtuous and happy you must render the circumstances operating upon him favourable to virtue and happiness—and III. That the nature of man is such, and the nature of this world is such, that perfect happiness, health, peace and plenty, may be secured to as many beings as can be born into it.

Now in reference to these principles we would say one word to Mr. Owen and his followers, or rather to the latter, since Mr. Owen must know the truth of what we are going to say perfectly well. The first of these principles is nothing but the well-known and long-advocated doctrine of Philosophical Necessity, under a different name—the second is an inevitable deduction from it—and the third is another and rather stronger form of what has long passed in this country under the name of optimism. That man is the creature of circumstances, including in that term as Mr. Owen must in all consistency allow us to do, the *moral* and *intellectual powers* with which he has individually been endowed,* we believe as firmly as himself. That to amend him collectively or individually you must amend the circumstances in which he is placed, seems to us a truism, after admitting the former position. And with regard to the declaration that this World is designed to be, and is capable of being, the scene of plenty and of happiness to all its inhabitants, in proportion as they develope its resources, study the Laws by which it is governed, and comprehend their own best and truest interests—this is part of our doctrine of Providence, one of the most cherished articles of our Faith. We may not indeed be prepared to say that these results will ever be so perfectly attained, as that there shall be an utter end to pain and sorrow—but we will not quarrel with Mr. Owen on this point: we believe with him that the amount of human sorrow may be perpetually decreasing, and if he or any one else should be able to make it disappear altogether, we will most delightedly abandon our present reserve. But in the meantime we sufficiently agree with him to avow that we are optimists, and that optimism, while studying the causes of evil, and struggling to remove them, is one of the best guides of human progress.

Here, then, are Mr. Owen's Fundamental *Principles*—principles by no means original, but substantially held in common with many a wise Philosopher, and many a benevolent Divine. Next, however, comes the application of these principles, from which we are obliged to express a thorough and unqualified dissent.

The circumstances, reasons Mr. Owen, in which man is placed form his character as a *rational or irrational,* as a *moral or an immoral,* as a happy or unhappy being. But man, as he is, is an irrational, an immoral, and an unhappy being; whereas man, as he may and ought to be, is a rational, a moral, and a happy being. Circumstances having made him what he is, and circumstances alone being capable of making him what he ought to be, our efforts to amend him must commence with amending the circumstances in which he has been placed. These have hitherto been entirely and unmixedly bad, and the effects have been of the same character: these we must change, if we would produce effects of an opposite character.

---

* This point will be alluded to again presently.

The grand feature in man's circumstances hitherto has been the consciousness and practice of individuality: the grand feature in his improved circumstances must be the consciousness and practice of society. He has hitherto been made to think that he is one, by himself, with separate and individual interests; he must now be made to think that he is part of a race, with only such interests as are common to all, and as will be best promoted by complete union with all. Hitherto he has been a selfish being, seeking only his own ends. He must now become a social being, seeking only society's ends. He must therefore give up all idea of having any select or personal interests, or anything in the shape of property. In reference to these things the word "our" must be substituted for the word "my." He must no longer talk of my house, my garden, my children—but our houses, our gardens, our children. No one must be rich or poor, except as a social being, that is to say, except as the community is rich or poor. All labour therefore must be directed towards one common object, and the proceeds must be thrown into one common fund. For this reason therefore all must work in equal proportion and according to their several capacities: we must not have one man always labouring, and another never labouring, nor yet one man living in a splendid house and another in a miserable hovel. All such contrasts must cease, for we must have man no longer labouring for himself, but for all.

Such are, generally stated, the circumstances which are to produce a train of blessings to mankind as uniform and as complete, as the train of evils now is, which has been produced by the old circumstances. There is to be no more poverty, crime, or disease—no more jealousy, selfishness, or avarice. Individual competition will be replaced by social co-operation—and all the ills of life will cease.

We will now endeavour to show the faults we find in this both as argument and as speculation. In the first place, the whole is a conclusion, not only not to be derived from, but directly opposed to the premiss (understood in Mr. Owen's own sense) from which it is said to flow. Mr. Owen sets outs with saying that man is the creature of circumstances; and the whole of this argument goes to prove that circumstances are the creatures of man. He declares that circumstances have entire control over man, and then in carrying out his Theory, the very foundation of its success is made to lie on the exact reversal of this proposition, namely, that man can control the circumstances. It is the circumstances that Mr. Owen means to control, that he says he must and will control, without controlling which he confesses that he cannot stir one step, and we suppose Mr. Owen is a man. Mr. Owen's first principle, and Mr. Owen's whole system, stare each other in the face as blank and irretrievable contradictions. Now we will maintain, if Mr. Owen wishes it, the doctrine of circumstances as strongly, and far more consistently than he, but with this difference, that we assert the possession of moral and mental power to be one of the circumstances of man's lot: and that this circumstance endues him with a power over many external circumstances, and for this cause Mr. Owen's reasoning on responsibility also falls to the ground, because among the circumstances to which man is responsible is that of the greater or the less moral power which he has within him over external circumstances.

The next fault we find with this system, is, that when stripped of adventitious qualities, it is reducible to a simple assumption, of which there exists and can exist, until experiment, no proof, except Mr. Owen's word. Mr. Owen says the present arrangements of society are all bad; the arrangements which he proposes are all good. The reception or rejection of this assertion depends upon the trust or the distrust which a person may have of Mr. Owen's judgment—a quality, on his possession of which it is unfortunate that so weighty a decision should rest, since, if there be one man in the realm who has more often and more palpably misjudged the signs of the times, the state of the world, and the dispositions of mankind, than another—that man is Robert Owen. Alas! for the system which rests on the *judgment* of an insanely-sanguine man.

The next objection we have to this system, is that so far from reverting to the fundamental facts of human nature, it runs directly counter to them. We take these to be among the strongest facts and principles of human nature: that the necessity for individual exertion, if only in order to preserve life, and the desire, by exertion, to supply with all the requisites of comfortable existence, both moral, mental, and physical, those who are bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, form the chief motives to labour with the great mass of mankind. Even the passion for wealth, or the habit of acquiring it, originates almost invariably here. Take away from men the necessity for exertion, and in the mass you take away the chief and original, though certainly not the only or the highest motive for exertion. We do not say that Mr. Owen's system absolutely does away with this. But it trespasses upon it, it diminishes it, it shares the necessity, it lifts it off individual shoulders. We do not wish to disparage human benevolence, but looking simply and candidly, not merely at society as it is, but at what we must consider "the fundamental facts" of human nature, we are firmly persuaded that, allow Mr. Owen to complete his system, and place us (as highly educated and prepared for the change as is possible) in community, and he would find that he was looking for effects when he had removed the causes; that he had engines, but no moving power.

Mr. Owen is not one of those Reformers who despise the advantages of our present state of civilization—however irrational they may be in their origin, he grants that they are desirable in themselves. He would, therefore, perpetuate and promote our knowledge of art and science, and retain all the ornament and grace of life. All the results of machinery—all the wealth of architecture, sculpture, music, painting, are to be still retained. A fourth objection to his system, therefore, is, that he would profit by all the skill which the division and the uninterruptedness of labour have put at our disposal, without continuing the means which gave it birth. If there be one thing more plain than another in the History of the Arts, it is this, that each artist has attained his skill by confining himself almost exclusively to his particular branch, and this too unremittingly. Mr. Owen says, that no man should labour more than two or three hours a-day, and that that labour should be healthily varied. The sculptor or the painter must, in the proper course of succession, leave his model or his easel, and take a healthy turn at the plough; and the young lady must, at the proper time, desert the nice touch of the piano, for the more salubrious employments of milking or of churning.* There is an airy and Arcadian simplicity about all this, but let Mr. Owen put it into practice for fifty years, and we will venture to say that neither he nor any one else will have a decent coat on his back, a good picture to look at, or a good chair to sit upon, good music to listen to, or good butter for his bread.

Such are the main features of Socialism—and such the overpowering objections to them. But untenable and insane as the system must be confessed to be—whence the great alarm at it, as mischievous, wicked, and immoral? As far as we have yet gone, though there is nothing very wise, there is nothing very wicked about it. It would seem to be nothing more than one of the thousand and one proposals to reform the world by a *coup de main*, which have been born from the brains of benevolent visionaries, but condemned to die in infancy from cruel neglect. This is evidently the view which many noble lords had taken of it, when, on occasion of Bishop Philpotts's outcry, they expressed their surprise at its being considered an immoral and blasphemous system.

---

* Fact, from New Harmony.

The explanation is at hand. Of late years Mr. Owen, not content with promulgating his system as, what it really is, a politico-economical system, has seen fit, very constantly and publicly, to express his views on Religion and Morals. These views have so much more startled men's minds, than have the economical views charmed them, that the first have been seized upon by the public mind to the oversight almost of the latter. So that Socialism is now, not so much the living together in communities, as a set of opinions, held by Mr. Owen, tending to the overthrow of religion, and the present system of marriage. In common parlance, Mr. Owen believes nothing. We should be surprised indeed if he did: having need of so much faith to go on trusting in the efficacy of his own system, we cannot imagine that he would have one atom to spare for anything else.

It is against this adventitious feature in the system, that so many pens have been directed—and it is on it that Mr. Beard's and Mr. Giles's Lectures principally treat. It has been felt, we suppose, that Socialism as a system of political economy was harmless, whereas, as a system of irreligion, it was mischievous. For ourselves we have had from the first, and still have, a general belief, that it will work its own good even in this way. Say, for instance, that the present belief respecting the Nature, Character, and Attributes of the Deity be abandoned, and that a cold and negative state of conviction called Atheism, succeed; there are still left these elements—belief in a Power (be it what it may), and a belief that this world and man are made for happiness. From these elements we see, as of necessity, arising a far purer faith than the one now abandoned by so many. We see every likelihood, not indeed of a return to the God of Calvin, but of a return to the God of Nature and of Jesus.

Of the marriage system as proposed by Mr. Owen, we can scarcely bring ourselves to say a word. Had Mr. Owen advocated increased facility of divorce, though viewing the advantages expected to accrue from it as very problematical, we yet should not have thought him deserving of opprobrium on that account, for the great and pure-minded Milton advocated the same. But the system which Mr. Owen does propose, is so absolutely revolting and licentious, that we can only account for its existence in an otherwise well-meaning man's mind, by the glaring fact, that he regards men simply as animals, and would legislate for them as he would for horses.* But our present purpose is accomplished in the endeavour to lay before the reader at a glance, the real bearings and divisions of this much bruited theory: the simple explanation of which, and of its partial success, is this—that Mr. Owen has come before a hard-working and sometimes needy and suffering population, and declared his purpose to be to make man *a well fed and a well housed animal.* Charmed by this promise thousands have gathered round him, and as with David "every one that was in distress, and every one that was in debt, and every one that was discontented, gathered themselves unto him, and he became a captain over them;" so with Mr. Owen, every one who preferred working two or three hours a-day instead of eight or ten—every one who had a bad wife and wanted to get rid of her, or a good one but did not know it—every one who wanted a palace instead of a cottage to live in—have gathered themselves to Mr. Owen and he has become a captain over them.

---

* Mr. Owen and his followers are great advocates of morality, and their "religion" is to "seek the happiness of all." The sect of Anabaptists in the beginning of the sixteenth century, with their leader John Boccold, were also enthusiastically zealous for their Christian liberty, and for the religion of the spirit. There is a singular analogy in the principles of the two parties, and we think if these were carried out, there would be also in their effects. The reader is referred to Robertson's History of Charles V., about this period for a more detailed account of this sect; but we make a few extracts to indicate the nature and extent of the resemblance. They thought that all men should be considered equal, that the distinctions occasioned by birth, or rank, or wealth, should be entirely abolished, that all, throwing their possessions into one common stock, should live together in that state of equality which becomes members of the same family, that as neither *the laws of nature* nor the precepts of the New Testament (!) had placed any restraints upon men with regard to the number of wives which they might marry, they should use their Christian liberty. Boccold led the way. "After the example of their prophet," says Robertson, "the multitude gave themselves up to the most licentious and uncontrolled gratification of their desires. No man remained satisfied with a single wife. *Not to use their Christian liberty was deemed a crime.*" "Together with polygamy, freedom of divorce, its inseparable attendant, was introduced and became a new source of corruption. Every excess was committed of which the passions of men are capable, when restrained neither by the authority of the laws, nor the sense of decency." We forbear to give more, or more painful quotations: such as the extract from Joh. Corvinus. Mr. Owen may talk of his regulations about three and six and twelve months, &c. &c. These are cobwebs to catch flies with, and when taken together with his avowed general principles, would be about as potent to restrain his community, as the aforesaid cobwebs would be to restrain lions.

Let noble Lords and Right Rev. Prelates be re-assured then: if they would only have the extreme good sense to leave legislating on these matters, they would find that it is Mr. Owen's promises, not Mr. Owen's metaphysics or Atheism, that have won the hearts of so many of our working classes, and therefore, if they will only let those promises die a natural death, instead of keeping them in a kind of prolonged existence by means of the drugs of their addresses and their charges, they will find the Atheism vanish too. Not that the old state of things will return, or that Trinitarianism, atonement, high views of the inspiration of the Scriptures, can ever come back from the fiery ordeal of Owenism, but that true religion will, we are confident. But it is the former probably, that their Lordships wish to rescue from the flames: then verily they must be quick, and not mind if their robes and lawn sleeves do get a little burnt in the attempt.

Into the detailed consideration of Owenism we need not enter, even had we space to do so adequately, for this has been already done in an immense variety of publications. We would especially, however, single out for recommendation from all that we have seen, Mr. Beard's lectures, as the very best and most successful. They were originally delivered in the author's own chapel in Salford, and afterwards published, both separately and collectively, at a cheap price. They treat on the following subjects:

The authority of the Christian Scriptures explained and asserted.

Christianity distinguished from its corruptions.

Persecution not sanctioned, but condemned by the Religion of Christ.

The Atheistical tendencies of Owenism exposed.

Man's character formed by and for him.

Man, a responsible being.

Owenism destructive to the existence, virtue and happiness of Home.

Claims of Jesus Christ to love and reverence.

Beneficial influence of the religion of Jesus Christ.

The lectures have the double advantage of combating error and maintaining truth. They have a strong affirmative as well as negative character. While they refute Owenism (as Mr. Beard with accuracy calls the opinions against which he contends as distinguished from the economical system which is properly Socialism), they also exhibit in a most winning and truthful form, the prized and holy religion of Jesus. They are written with a vigorous freshness of style rising continually into the eloquent, and with a variety of illustration and a rapidity of conception, which render them most interesting reading. If any one is anxious to check the progress of these opinions in any particular neighbourhood, he cannot do better than circulate freely these lectures. They have one quality which renders them particularly likely to do good, and that is, that they argue with the Owenite, they take him on his own ground, they have not the appearance of aiming so much to gratify the angry and outraged feelings of assentient hearers, as to convince and persuade the Owenite himself. We could indeed have wished while reading them, that some of the warmer passages had been a little qualified, not that we dissented from them, but that we thought the opponent might regard himself as aggrieved. But our surprise on the whole is, that considering the occasions for which they were prepared, and the short interval after delivery at which they were published, there should be so little ground of objection in this particular. Even these passages are milk and honey, to the vinegar and gall which issue in streams from most of the publications on the same side of the controversy. We cannot better express our sense of the very high excellence of Mr. Beard's volume than by saying that it is a book of pure practical Religion, and of sound and rational Theology, at the same time that it is a manly, vigorous, warm-hearted and convincing attack upon false and mischievous principles. We are at a loss to select particular passages for quotation, the lectures are so spirited and admirable throughout, but we may perhaps supply our readers with some extracts in a future number, when the general question has not occupied so much room.

In the Lectures of Mr. Giles, who is a Baptist Minister at Leeds, we have been much disappointed. Mr. Giles is a clever man, and we had expected more from his much talked of Lectures. But he does not seem to have thrown himself at all into the spirit of argument. He seems to have lectured at the Owenite, instead of reasoning with him. He is evidently only at home with the strictly Theological aspects of the case. But here he puts forth one or two very ingenious and accurate arguments. At pp. 11, 12, for example, there is a position very skilfully maintained in reference to Mr. Owen's admission, that there is an omnipresent and all-pervading power, from which we extract one sentence, containing nearly the gist of the argument—" Since it is impossible," he says, "for bodies to exist or move, *without space unoccupied by matter* to exist or move in, and equally certain that the omnipresent Deity, if material, filling the Universe with matter, would leave *no* space unoccupied, it follows, either that motion and created bodies have no existence, or that the 'Omnipresent' Deity cannot be material." But how would the Socialist or any one else who understands the subject, respect such reasoning or endure such misconception, as the following supposed illustration of the doctrine of circumstances—published, too, twelve months after its delivery.

> "If, for instance, a thief, having stolen a purse, should assert that it influenced and acted upon his organization, and that, being the creature of the purse, he was irresponsible for what it formed him to be and compelled him to do independently of himself, would not such a defence involve a direct inversion of facts, and however accurately copied from 'the moral science of man,' lend to his crime the aggravation of falsehood ?"

The reply to these Lectures by Mr. Joshua Hobson is ushered in by a very calm and sufficiently modest introduction, which comes in oddly, (as many Prefaces do) when considered as a prelude to some pretty warm and criminatory Lectures. Mr. Hobson lays on one side Mr. Giles's theological arguments, as having nothing to do with Socialism, which expressly provides that "all shall have equal right to express their opinion respecting a first cause, and to worship it (individually) under any form or in any manner agreeable to their consciences, not interfering with equal rights in others." This is a sign of the confusion which has existed in the terms employed, and shows the foresight and discrimination with which Mr. Beard chose the word Owenism, as indicating the system which he was about to attack. Mr. Hobson occupies himself chiefly with refuting the misrepresentations which he charges Mr. Giles with having made of Socialism. He denies that any immoral practices exist in or are sanctioned by their communities, and defies Mr. Giles to the proof. This is well-timed and much needed, for we have often felt angry when we have heard evening entertainments, where there was music and dancing, to which the public was invited, and at which all intoxicating liquors were forbidden, called "midnight orgies," and other strong names, which did not appear to be justified by fact.

The author draws a most ridiculous picture of the miseries of married life, which he (surely in irony) declares to be underdrawn. (p. 132.) Mr. Hobson should reflect that there is likely to be a huge conglomeration of bad domestic cases in his community, because those that are unhappy are those most likely to visit the Halls of Socialism, while those that are happy are most likely to stay at home. He will be in error, then, when he judges of the world at large by the condition of those select few, who gather into community ; as he will also be in error if he forgets that nine out of ten even of those who are unhappy, would be unhappy anywhere. The sources of their unhappiness may indeed be at home—but the home will often be that of their own bosoms. Mr. Giles charges the Socialists with not "meeting the evidences of Christianity," and the reply is in a passage which we will quote, and which it would be well, should be impressed on the minds of all magistrates who may be thinking, at Bishop Philpotts's beck, of putting *down* Socialism instead of refuting it, and thus placing a weapon in the hands of the enemy, which has ever been one of the most successful that the oppressed can wield. Many a man who now looks at least as suspiciously at the salaried Socialist Lecturer, as he does at the Priest, will, when the Priest or the Priest's agents begin to persecute Owenism, on pretence of prosecuting unstamped publications, turn the scale in favour of the oppressed, and at length believe that religion is strong in the Law, and not in the heart and convictions of man.

> "Carlisle attempted to 'meet' those 'evidences' by the simple publication of—Paine's Age of Reason, and he was 'met' with six years' imprisonment in Dorchester Gaol. Taylor attempted to 'meet' the historical 'evidences of Christianity as found in the works of Lardner, &c." and he was 'met' by the iron grates, strong bolts, and closed doors of Oakam Castle, and Horsemonger Lane Gaol! 'Twas well the Socialist did not find it necessary, in planning a new polity for the governing and educating of mankind, to 'meet the evidences of Christianity'—not as furnished in the works of Lardner, Cudworth, Newton, Paley, and the whole host of others who have furnished such evidences—but in the damp and gloomy cell, in the clanking irons, and in the bolted doors of a dungeon, or he might have felt them more difficult to 'meet' than he at first imagined."

C. W.

Art. VII.—MÉMOIRES DE LUTHER, écrits par lui même, traduits et mis en ordre par M. Michelet. Paris, 1835.

We have no hesitation in recommending this work to the notice of our readers, as one full of mental, moral, and historic interest, and will endeavour by way of tempting them to its perusal, to give a short sketch of it chiefly in extracts from the work itself. Its nature is best described in the Editor's own words:

> " Hitherto little has been known of Luther but his quarrel with Rome. We give his whole life—its combats—doubts—temptations, consolations. We shew this violent and terrible reformer, not only in his Eagle's nest at Wartbourg, or braving the Emperor at the Diet of Worms, but in his home at Wittemberg, in the midst of his friends and his children, sitting with them at table, walking with them in his garden, and we hear him thinking aloud, finding food for pious thought in all that surrounds him, whether flowers, fruit, or the bird that passes idly by."

And never surely were the unbendings of a mind more worthy of its higher powers. Those who have known Luther only in his public character, and have sorrowed over the violence and dogmatism that too often break forth, will be grateful to Michelet, for presenting him under another aspect, in a better and more prevalent mood,—doubly grateful will they be, since the severe and unrelenting censure which Hallam has lately passed on his writings, and which necessarily extends to the mind that dictated them. From that very Epistle to Erasmus prefixed to the treatise De servo Arbitrio, which Hallam designates "as bitterly insolent", in terms as civil as he could use, Michelet gives us the following passages:

> " Assuredly, you may well feel arrested in the presence of so numerous a train of learned men—by the assent of so many centuries, distinguished by men able in sacred literature, by noble martyrs, and glorified by many miracles. I acknowledge, dear Erasmus, it is with good reason you hesitate before all these things; I did the same ten years ago. I hesitated —could I believe that this Troy, which so long had victoriously resisted every assault, was ever to fall? I call God and my own soul to witness, I should have persevered in this fear, I should be hesitating still, at this day, if conscience, if truth had not forced me to speak. I have not, you may well believe, a heart of flint, and if I had, buffetted as it has been, by so many waves and storms, it must have broken, when all this weight of authority opened upon me, as a deluge ready to overwhelm."

Elsewhere he says,

"What I suffered the first and second year, in what dejection, not feigned or supposed, but most real, or rather in what despair I was plunged, is little known to those confident spirits who have since attacked the Pope with so much pride and presumption."

Surely here is no rash contempt for the opinions of his fellow men; who would wish human deference to go further? And view him next hesitating in the heavenly presence, pausing before the eyes of Angels and of God:

"I have learnt even of the Holy Scripture that it is a thing full of peril and terror, to raise one's voice in the Church of God, to speak in the midst of those, who will be your judges, when at the day of reckoning, you will stand in the sight of God and of Angels, every creature seeing, hearing, and giving heed to the Divine Word—Assuredly when I think of it, I should desire nothing so much as silence, and a sponge to wipe out all my writings."

Surely these, and many similar touching confessions, can never have met Mr. Hallam's eye, or he would have mingled some relenting and qualifying words with the harsh censure that "an unbounded dogmatism, resting on an absolute confidence in the infallibility, practically speaking, of his own judgment, pervades Luther's writings; and whatever stands in the way of his decisions, the fathers of the church, the schoolmen and philosophers, the canons and councils, are swept away in a current of impetuous declamation." How explanatory and mitigating is Melancthon's testimony.

"Whoever knew Luther intimately, will acknowledge that he was an excellent man, gentle and amiable in society—in no degree tenacious or a lover of dispute. If he evinced harshness in combating the enemies of the true doctrine—it arose from no malignity of nature, but from an ardent passion for the truth."

Michelet's work commences with a sketch of his parentage and educational career, of his becoming a Monk, his visit to Rome, &c. It is striking to observe the purely accidental way in which Luther was led step by step to his great work of Reformation,—accidental we mean as far as human design went, free from any personal intention: for the way in which he was trained and fitted for his task, and impelled to it by the educating hand of Providence, is no less observable than his own unconsciousness of the work for which he was preparing.

Luther himself thus briefly comments upon the strange unexpected turns of his life.

"I am the son of a peasant; my father, grandfather, and great grandfather were all true peasants. My father went to Mansfeld, and became a miner. I was born there, that I was to be afterwards *Bachelor, Doctor, &c.*,—was not written in the stars. Did I not astonish people by becoming a Monk? then by quitting my brown cap for another? That truly vexed my father and hurt him much. Then I fell to war with the Pope, and the Pope and I fell together by the ears. I married a run-away nun and had children by her; who read all that in the stars? who could have told me beforehand, that it was so to happen?"

The Biographer adds to this brief summary, the following particulars:

"Martin Luther was born at Eisleben, the 10th of November, 1483. Being early sent to school at Eisenach, 1489, he went about singing at the street doors, in order to gain his bread, as did many of the poor students in Germany at that time. It is from himself that we have this anecdote—'Let no one venture to despise, in my presence, the poor companions who go about singing and saying from door to door: *panem propter Deum.* You know how the Psalm has it—*Princes and Kings have sung.* I also have been a poor beggar, I have received bread at the doors of houses, particularly at Eisenach, my dear town.'

"He afterwards found a more certain subsistence and an asylum in the house of Dame Ursula, wife or widow of Jean Schweickard, who had compassion on the young wanderer. The assistance of this charitable woman enabled him to study four years at Eisenach. In 1501, he entered the University of Erfurth, where he was supported by his father. Luther somewhere remembers his benefactress in words full of feeling, and was grateful to the sex all his life after.

"After having made some attempts at Theology, he was determined by the counsels of his friends, to enter on the study of the law, which at that time led to the most lucrative places in Church and State. But he never appears to have relished it. He preferred general literature, and above all music. This was his favorite art. He cultivated it all his life, and taught it to his children. Nor did he hesitate to declare that Music ranked next to Theology in his esteem. 'Music was the art of the prophets—the only one which, like Theology, can calm the troubles of the soul, and put the devil to flight.' This taste for music and literature, the assiduous study of the poets, which he mingled with that of dialectics and law, little bespoke that he was soon to play so serious a part in the history of religion.

"In 1505, an accident gave a new turn to the life of the young man. He saw one of his friends killed by lightening at his side. He uttered a cry, and this cry was a vow to Saint Ann, to make himself a monk, if he escaped. The danger over, he did not seek to elude an engagement extorted by terror" (and here is character, not circumstance). "He solicited no dispensation. He regarded the blow which so nearly reached him, as a menace and an order from on high. He delayed only fourteen days the fulfilment of his vow. The 17th of July, 1505, after having passed the evening cheerfully with his friends, he entered at night the cloister of the Augustins at Erfurth, carrying with him only his Plautus and his Virgil. The following day he informed his father of his resolution, and was a month without choosing to see any one.

He felt how strongly he yet held by the world, and dreaded the respected face of his father—his orders and his entreaties. In fact, it was two years before John Luther would consent to assist at his ordination. We must not suppose that in taking these formidable vows, the new priest was prompted by any singular zeal. We have seen with what stock of worldly literature he entered the cloister. Having at length accomplished his object, become a monk, and closed the door on the world, there followed, I do not say regrets, but sadness, perplexity, trials of the flesh and of the spirit. We know little in these days of the rude gymnastics which these solitary minds had to undergo. In our present enervating variety of business, study, and easy enjoyments, in this premature satiety of the senses and the intellect, how can we understand the spiritual warfare which the man of the middle age carried on with his own soul, the painful mysteries of an abstinent and fantastic life, the terrible combats that took place noiselessly and without record, within the walls and sombre grating of a poor monk's cell."

Then follow some painful details of these struggles—the seeking help and finding none, from those who had trod the same thorny path.

"It appears that from his school days he had been possessed with an intense desire to know the true meaning of St. Paul's expression in the Epistle to the Romans, chap. i. ver. 17 and 18.—For therein is the righteousness of God revealed, &c. &c., that he rebelled at the common explanation given, of its referring to the active justice of the Deity in punishing sinners, and meditated day and night for a better understanding of the text. At last he paid a visit to Italy, hoping to strengthen his faith in the holy city, and to leave his doubts on the tombs of the apostles. He was received at Milan, in a convent of marble. He journeyed from convent to convent, that is, from palace to palace. Everywhere good cheer, sumptuous tables—the true hearted German was somewhat astonished at this magnificent humility, this royal splendor of penitence. He ventured once to tell the Italian monks they would do better to abstain from flesh on Fridays. The warning had nearly cost him his life; he escaped with difficulty from their toils, and continued his journey, sad, undeceived, and on foot, through the burning plains of Lombardy. He at length entered Rome, and stopped at the convent of his order near Il porto del Popolo. 'When I arrived, I fell on my knees, raised my hands to heaven and cried—Hail! holy city, sanctified by the blood of the holy martyrs shed within you.' In his fervour, he sped through all the holy places, saw every thing—believed every thing. He soon perceived that he alone believed. Christianity seemed forgotten in this capital of the Christian world. The Pope was the warlike and choleric Julius the 2nd—this father of the faithful, breathed only blood and ruin. The Pope, and all Rome, had no thoughts but for the war with the French. If our German took refuge in the churches, he had not even the consolation of hearing a good mass. The Roman priest expedited the service with such rapidity that Luther was still at the Gospel when the priest said to him: *Ite, missa est*. These Italian priests would sometimes make display of a scandalous audacity of mockery. They would say in consecrating the host: '*panis est, et panis manebis*.' There was nothing left but to veil the face and fly. Luther quitted Rome at the end of fourteen days. He carried back into Germany the condemnation of Italy and of the church. In this sad and hasty journey the Saxon had seen enough to condemn, too little to understand. And certainly, for a mind pre-occupied with the moral view of Christianity, it would have required a singular effort of philosophy, a very precocious historic sense, to discover religion in that world of the arts, of law, and of politics which then constituted Italy. 'I would not,' says Luther, somewhere, and he repeats the words three times, 'I would not but have seen Rome, for a hundred thousand florins, I should have been always uneasy, lest perhaps I had done injustice to the Pope.'"

Then follows a very lively narrative of what passed at the Diet at Worms by Luther himself, which Michelet says agrees in the main with those given by his enemies. Then of his residence in the Castle of Wartbourg—which he at last quitted without leave from the Elector, to whom he addresses a spirited letter, accounting for this movement, from which we shall extract a few passages, evincing the lofty and determined spirit of the man.

"It is not from man that I hold the Gospel, but from heaven, from our Lord Jesus Christ, and I might have done, as I shall do henceforth, call myself his servant, and take the title of an Evangelist. It is enough, that to please your Grace, I have passed a year in retirement. The devil knows that it was not from fear, he saw my heart when I entered Worms. Had the city been full of devils, I should have thrown myself into it with joy. Now Duke George can not pass for a devil; and your Grace will himself say if it is not an unworthy outrage on the Father of Mercies, to fear the anger of this duke. If God called me to Leipsig, his capital, as he now calls me to Wittemberg, I would go, even though it should rain Duke Georges nine days together, and every one of them nine times more furious. Does he then take Jesus Christ for a man of straw? God may tolerate such things once or twice, but not for ever."

"I write this to let you know that I am going to Wittemberg, under higher protection than that of the Elector, therefore, have I no intention of asking support from your Grace. I am even presumptuous enough to think that I shall protect rather than be protected; if I knew that I must be protected by you, I would not come. The sword can do nothing in this matter, God must act, and without man's intermeddling. He who has the most faith, will protect the most efficaciously, and as I know your Grace to be, as yet, very weak in the faith, I can in no wise behold in you the man who is to protect and save me. Your Grace asks what he ought to do in these circumstances, esteeming that he has done little heretofore. I answer, with all submission, that your Grace has done only too much, and that he ought to do nothing. God desires not all this disquietude, all this action, when his cause is in question, he desires that we refer ourselves to Him alone."

All the scattered details given of his after career, amid the hostile opposition of enemies, and the more cruel extravagances of partisans—his exhortations to the princes and nobles, and to the revolted peasants, are full of the most lively interest, and make us feel that whatever be the faults of Luther, he was a noble being, engaged heart and soul in the greatest of all causes—the cause of God and of mankind—following the truth fearlessly wheresoever it might lead, and confronting dauntlessly for its sake, the great and mighty of the earth. Surely we might better appreciate the blessing of religious freedom he has won for us, better sympathise in the toil and the strife, the vexations and bitter disappointments through which he won it, than to visit harshly the unfortunate aggravations of temper and violence of condemnation it produced.

But the most attractive part of the work is the domestic details, the unbendings of this robust and rigorous intellect in his home circle—the carrying forth of those Christian principles, for which he fought so valiantly on the public stage, into the minutiæ of private life—their practical embodying in the father, the husband, and the master. He thus proved himself worthy the championship of the Christian faith, showing that he understood it, not less in its depths than in its heights, in its influence on the individual than on mankind at large. The following are a specimen of the scattered fragments of this kind which Michelet has gathered together.

"'Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling.' There is no contradiction here, it is what my little son does with his father. But I cannot do as much as respects God. If I am seated at table, writing or doing anything else, my boy sings me a song; if he sings too loud, and I tell him so, he continues, but to himself and with some timidity. God would have us always gay, but a gaiety mingled with awe and reserve." "The doctor's little children were standing round the table, looking with great attention at some peaches which were handing round. Whoever would see the image of a soul rejoicing hope, may find it here. Ah! if we could await the life to come with a like eager joy!"

Another time when his little son Martin was feeding at his mother's breast, the Doctor said,

"This infant and all that belongs to me, is hated by the Pope and Duke George, hated by all their partisans, hated by the Devil. But little does he care for all these enemies, little does he trouble himself that so many and such powerful personages owe him a grudge; he gaily takes his meal, looks laughingly around, and lets them storm as they will."

"'What must have been Abraham's feelings when he consented to sacrifice his only son? He could have said nothing of it to Sarah, that would have cost him too much. Truly I should dispute with God if he were to impose such a thing upon me.' 'I cannot think,' replied his wife, 'that God would ever require of any one that they should slay their own child.'"

"One evening the Doctor saw a little bird perched on a tree, preparing to pass the night there; he said, 'This little bird has chosen its shelter, and is going to sleep tranquilly, he takes no troublesome thought for the lodging of the morrow; he reposes quietly on his little bough, and leaves God to think for him.' Another evening two birds who were making their nest in the Doctor's garden, took fright constantly at those who passed. 'Ah! dear little bird,' said he, 'do not fly away, I wish thee well with all my heart, if thou couldst only think so! It is thus we refuse to confide in God, who far from willing us to perish, has given us his only son.'"

"'There is no alliance or companionship so beautiful, so gentle and so happy, as a good marriage. It is joy to see husband and wife live united and in peace. But then, nothing is so bitter or so painful as the severing of this bond. Then comes the death of children. This last grief, alas! I know it.' During his daughter's illness, (she died at the age of fourteen) he said, 'I love her well! but oh my God! if it be thy will to take her hence, I will without regret learn that she is with thee. My dear daughter,' said he to her, 'my little Madeline, you would willingly remain here with your father, but you would also willingly go to your other Father.' 'Yes, my dear father,' she replied, 'yes, as God wills it.' 'Dear little daughter,' added he, 'the spirit is willing but the flesh is weak.' He walked up and down her chamber saying, 'Yes, I have loved her very dearly, if the flesh is thus strong, what must the spirit then be?' And after her death, gazing upon her as she lay in her coffin, 'I am joyous in spirit, but oh how sad in the flesh! How strange to know her thus happy, thus at peace, and yet to be so full of grief.' He writes to one of his friends, 'Report will probably have informed you that my daughter Madeline is born again into the kingdom of Christ, and although my wife and I ought to think only of returning joyous thanks for so happy a passage, and so desirable an end by which she has escaped from the power of the flesh, the world, and the Devil, yet is the strength of emotion such that I cannot bear up without sobs, groans, say rather without a real breaking of the heart. In the depth of my soul are engraved her features, her words, her gestures during her life and on her bed of death, my obedient and darling child! even the death of Christ, and what are all other deaths in comparison? cannot win me from this as it ought. She was, as you know, gentle in character, amiable and full of tenderness.'"

"To the Gracious Lady Catharine Luther, my dear wife who torments herself far too much, grace and peace in the Lord, Dear Catharine! you ought to read St John, and what the catechism says upon the confidence which we should have in God. You really distress yourself, as if God was not almighty, and could not produce new doctors Martin by the dozen, should the old one be drowned in the Saale, or perish in any other way. I have one who takes care of me better than you, or even the angels could do. He is seated at the right hand of the all powerful father, therefore be tranquil. Amen."

Luther writes to his wife about an old domestic that is going to quit them:

"We must dismiss our old John honourably; you know he has always served us loyally and zealously, as was fitting a Christian servant. How much have we not given away to vagrants and ungrateful students who have made a bad use of our money. We must not then economise on this occasion with so good a servant, with whom our money will be placed in a manner pleasing to God. I know we are not rich, I would willingly give him ten florins if I had them; but in any case, do not give him less than five, for he is not clothed—what more you can do, do it, I pray you. Think in what way you can raise the money,—we have a goblet of silver still to pledge, God will not abandon us, I am sure. Adieu."

We could, with pleasure, continue our extracts, and follow our author gratefully through the details of Luther's thoughts on the various momentous subjects that presented themselves to his mind, as step by step the Reformation proceeded on its way. We might point out how much he appears to have been one of those great men, who, as Cousin says, are rather the *expression* of the times in which they live, than the originators of them. How prepared and ready to burst forth were multitudes of minds, so soon as the first kindling spark fell upon them.

We might further vindicate his humility, that inevitable accompaniment of a great mind employed in a great cause—his large and well-based principles of toleration, that cry shame on the present day, when centuries have passed, and ought to have perfected us in the great lesson. We might follow him to his last days, and his dying chamber, and see him engaged to the last in his Master's work, that best work of peace making—but ready, yea rejoicing to depart—conscious of the high service on which he had been employed, and thankful, but not elated. We might quote his last Will and Testament, as one proof among many, of the tender respect and consideration he ever bore to woman, his high appreciation of their worth, and generous sympathy with their lot in life, worthy alike of the man and of the Christian. But we forbear, hoping that we have given enough to induce our readers to wish for more, and to seek for themselves in Michelet's work, the details of these and many other topics of interest.

Q. B.

Art. VIII.—THE RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSIES OF THE TIMES.

To the Editor of the Christian Teacher.

Sir,—Amidst all the controversies that distract the religious world, there are two which are preeminent at this time in Great Britain and Ireland. One of these is the Roman Catholic controversy—the other the Trinitarian one. The Clergy, and especially the Clergy of the Established Church of England and Ireland, seem to think that by engaging in either of these they are rendering service to God, and to their Church, and on either side they usually find not unwilling opponents. Public discussions on the former question have been more common in Ireland than in England, but the Trinitarian question has been brought forward in England several times within the last year. Now is this doctrine of the Trinity really the most important of those which occupy the religious world? or are the effects of it such as should make the Unitarian most anxious to assail it, or the Trinitarian to defend it? I think not. For the acknowledgement made by the Unitarian of Jesus Christ as the chosen and approved messenger of the most high God, leads him to place as much confidence in the promises, and to yield as much obedience to the commands of Christ, as if he were God; and the Trinitarian again in regarding him as the *man* Christ Jesus, made of human nature, regards him as much, (or consistently may do so,) a pattern, as those who look up to him as a preexistent though inferior spirit, or as a man like themselves. I may be at a loss how to reconcile the opinions, how to account for their being entertained, but I can conceive no difference as to the effect produced on the conduct of either by the instructions and example of Christ. Again as regards the Godhead, both parties assert the Unity, and whatever difficulty the Unitarian may have in conceiving how they can do so, Trinitarians, assigning as they do different offices to the different persons of their Godhead, never for an instant think of one being at variance with another. There is a complete *Unity* of design, a *oneness* as to everything that affects the creatures. It is in the connection with other doctrines more immediately influencing the conduct that good or harm is produced. Why then is this put forward as the most essential or the most obnoxious of doctrines? Why is it the primary object of all the late controversies of Protestants with each other? I suppose that as Transsubstantiation was long the leading subject in the controversy with Catholics—so the Trinity is in that with Unitarians, because those who believe it think that if a doctrine so repugnant to reason and so difficult to prove by clear evidence of Scripture could be once established, all the rest would readily follow; whilst the Unitarians perhaps think that if they can shake belief in this, they will have prepared the way for the rejection of other opinions they dislike,—or they may have been particularly annoyed by the repeated assertions of it in the public services of the Church. However this may be, believing as I do that the influence of these opinions on practice is not a *direct* one, and that good moral conduct (and in this I include all those duties we owe to God as well as to ourselves and our fellow men) will be the result of sincere belief in the divine mission of Christ, whatever opinion may be entertained of his personal dignity; believing this I conceive that there are questions of much greater and more immediate importance—questions which have indeed been ably discussed—but which are not made so much the prominent subjects of late controversies, as in my mind they deserve to be.

What is it which is the cause of the greatest bitterness amongst Christians? which makes some regard others as doomed to eternal misery? which destroys the peace of families when differences of opinion occur, which makes men forget all the charities of life and shun his brother man as an object of contempt or abhorrence—if he do not adopt the same creed—nay make him wish to deprive that brother of his political rights as if unworthy of them? Is not the foundation of all this, the opinion that he himself or the party he has attached himself to, is infallible? The Roman Catholic avows it—but others who deny it in words act upon it as much as he. "If he do not believe so and so he cannot be saved." This is the root of all bigotry—no man can say this unless he believes his party or himself *infallible*. It is the only excuse for the unwarrantable efforts to make converts—to draw people from one sect to another—to disturb even the couch of the dying. "Who art thou that judgest another? To his own Master he standeth or falleth"—"Our heavenly father has given you no power to condemn your brethren." To expose this besetting sin, to prove again and again that no man, priest or layman, Pope, or Bishop or presbyter, Council or Synod, has any right to fulminate his thunders or to issue his sentence of condemnation—but that every individual man has not only a right to judge for himself—and to bring up his children to his own faith, so long as they are children,—but also that he incurs no danger of future condemnation if his conduct has been suitable to the opinions he has honestly adopted. This should be the connecting bond of all friends of Christian liberty—the leading principle of associations which every man will support who is not in his heart the partizan of an infallible Church.

But some of those who venture to condemn their brethren will say, we are warranted by Scripture Authority—and this is infallible. We take the bible for our guide. This brings us to another and most important question on which men must be enlightened before they are prepared for discussing other subjects of controversy. Whilst the notion prevails that the bible is one book, every part of which is of equal authority, and that a verse in Genesis or in Ruth is of as much weight as the law delivered to Moses, or the divine effusions of Isaiah—or even as the recorded words of our Saviour himself,—so long as the whole bible is supposed to have been dictated by the Holy Ghost, and that from the first verse of Genesis to the last verse of the Revelation—it is equally of divine authority—equally to be studied as profitable for instruction,—so long as it is regarded as *one whole* instead of a collection of books of different authority, according to the writers or the circumstances attending them, liable to the errors of human writers and copiers; and resting on the external and internal evidence of each book as much as if they had never been collected in the same volume; so long I say as such notions of the bible continue to prevail as they now do, I do not anticipate any rapid progress of those opinions which I must regard as true, and to which I have been led by perusal of these Scriptures with the aids which criticism supplies. The supposed equal inspiration of the whole scripture lies at the root of the evil—" If you do not believe my creed you cannot be saved, but will perish everlastingly. So says my church, my church is founded on Scripture, the Scripture is infallible, therefore this saying is infallible." To expose such reasoning—to show that no church is warranted by Scripture to condemn others—to require proof of their authority—to maintain that we have no infallible Canon or infallible interpreter—to set before the public what is known to every critical scholar that there is very different evidence for different books of Scripture, and that a plenary inspiration, an inspiration of every part of Scripture and every word of it, even in the originals, has no authority—cannot be proved, and can be held *only* by members of an infallible church. Cure men of these errors and you may have some chance, if not of making many converts, of being allowed to hold your opinions in peace.

Δ

Art. IX.—TRADITIONS OF THE EAST.—From Herder.

THE CHILD OF MERCY.

When the Almighty meditated the creation of man, he assembled the Archangels in council around Him.

"Create him not!" thus spoke the Angel of Justice, "he will be unjust towards his brother, hard and cruel in his dealings with those weaker than himself."

"Create him not!" thus spoke the Angel of Peace, "he will drench the earth with human blood; the first-born of his race will slay his brother."

"Thy Sanctuary will he profane with lies," thus spoke the Angel of Truth, "even if thou shouldest stamp Thine own image, the Seal of Truth, upon his brow."

Still had they spoken when Mercy, the youngest best-beloved child of the Eternal Father, stept to His throne and embraced His feet, "Form him, Father," said she, "in thine own image, the darling child of thy goodness.—When all thy servants forsake him I will seek him, and dwell with him in love, and turn even his failings into virtues. The heart of the Weak one I will make bend in pity towards those yet weaker. When he strays from Peace and Truth, when he offends against Justice and Right, then by the very consequences of his errors shall he be led back to virtue and through love reformed."

The Father of men created man, a weak erring creature, but even in error the pupil of His goodness, son of a Mercy, son of a Love which never forsake him, ever bring him to perfection.

Remember thou thy origin, oh man! when thou art hard and pitiless. Of all God's attributes, Mercy alone has elected thee to life; and through life a mother's breast is afforded thee by Mercy only and Love.

LILIS AND EVE.

In solitude wandered Adam through Paradise. He tended the trees, gave names to the beasts of the field, enjoyed everywhere the fruitful and richly blessed creation, but among all living things found nothing that shared with him the desires of his heart. At length his eyes were fixed on one of those beautiful aerial spirits, which according to tradition were inhabitants of the earth long before man, and which his once clearer vision enabled him to behold.

Lilis was the name of the beautiful being. She dwelt like her sisters amidst the trees and flowers and lived only upon delicious odours.

"All creatures," exclaimed Adam to himself, "live in communion with one another; oh! that this beautiful creature were a mate for me!"

The Father of men heard his wish and spake thus: "Thou hast cast thine eyes upon a Form that is not created for thee; yet for the correction of thine error, let thy longing be satisfied." At the word of transformation Lilis stood before him in human form.

Joyfully Adam sprang towards her; but quickly he perceived his error, for the beautiful Lilis was proud and drew back from his embrace. "Am I of thy race?" said she. "Of the air of Heaven was I formed, and not of this low earth. My life is for a thousand years. The might of Spirits is my strength and sweet odours are my heavenly food. I may not multiply with thee thy low earth-begotten race."

She flew away and to her spouse returned no more.

God said, "It is not good for man to be alone. I will give him a help-meet for him."

Then a deep sleep fell on Adam and in a prophetic dream he beheld a new Image. From his side it stepped forth a being like himself. In joy awaking he beheld his second self; and when God led to him the Lovely one, lo! his heart throbbed, for even there had she dwelt. "Mine thou art!" he exclaimed, "thou shalt be called Woman—for from man hast thou been taken!"

Therefore, when God loves a young man, He gives him the Half which is his own, the vision of his heart for a wife. Feeling that they were created for one another, they daily grow into one image of increasing Harmony and youthful Beauty. But he who prematurely casts his eyes on stranger charms, who woos beings that belong not to him, embraces for chastisement a stranger Half. In one body two differing souls, torturing each other and themselves—go down in affliction to their grave.

THE BIRD OF IMMORTAL TRUTH.

In the midst of Paradise stood the most wondrous trees of the Earth—the Tree of Knowledge and the Tree of Life. Of the latter man was permitted to eat—but of the former for his children's sake, he was forbidden to taste. The solitary Phœnix, then still king of the feathered tribe, he alone nestled in its boughs and eat of its imperishable god-like food.

When Eve with a longing heart approached the Tree and would fain have tasted it, then was it that the winged Witness of Truth raised his voice in warning, thus—"Oh! thou deluded One! whither dost thou stray? To gaze upon what, wouldest thou open thine eyes? To see that thou art naked, thou wilt have wisdom?—to feel that thou art poor, thou wouldest become as gods?"

But Eve's gaze was fixed on the deceitful fruit, and on the wily Seducer. She transgressed God's command and listened not to the voice of the Prophet-Bird.

When the doom of Death came upon all the creatures of Paradise, God set apart the truthful Bird thenceforth to be a Witness of Truth for ever. With all living creatures he must indeed leave the Abode of Innocence. Of the birds, already warring against each other, he would remain no longer King; his once happy peaceful throne was seized upon by a Robber-bird, the blood-stained Eagle. Even his immortality thenceforth, in the thick poisonous atmosphere of Earth, could only be retained by a transformation—but a transformation taking place only once in a hundred years, and which quickly and gloriously renews his youth. When his hour approaches he is permitted to fly into the Garden of Eden; from the Trees of Knowledge and of Life, he gathers old withered boughs in whose flame he dissolves his limbs. The boughs from the Tree* of Wisdom brings him death; the flame from the Tree of Life brings him a new Youth. Then he retires again to his wildernesses, sorrowing for Paradise—the beautiful, the alone†, seldom-seen, still more seldom-followed, Bird of Immortal Truth.

Y.

---

* The French philosophers, to wit, of the 18th century; but the Immortal Bird has now been long a-burning. Is the new life at hand? Surely it has already come—abroad and at home men begin to regard it. Hail to it!—

† Einzige—unique. Have we no other word but this dilettanti epithet corresponding to the German? "Single" conveys to English ears little more than the immortal bird's widowed state, and I believe we have been forced to adopt the word Phœnix to express the fact of any object being the only one of its kind.

ART. X.—CHILDREN'S BOOKS.

To the Editor of the Christian Teacher.

SIR,—Education is now become a subject of much more extended interest than formerly; our views of it are much changed, and our facilities much encreased. We now look not so much to the instruction given by the master, as to the impression received by the pupil. Much as this has modified our teaching on all subjects, it has perhaps affected none so greatly as on the most important, Religion and Morality. Instead of the formal catechism with its uninteresting abstractions, so wearisome generally to both teacher and pupil, we endeavour to realize the great truths formerly so inculcated, by presenting them to the young as it were impersonated. An allwise, all benevolent creator, is brought before them in his works; an ever watchful and tender parent, is represented caring for them, and encouraging them to look to him for help, in every outward suffering, and in every inward conflict: a Saviour is realized to them, exciting their love of all that is excellent, showing them what they ought to be here, what they may hope to be hereafter. And this is done, not in a mist of language so unusual, and customs so unintelligible, that they seem to be transferred to some fabulous region, distant from this earth; but speaking in figures which their knowledge of the present manners of the East renders intelligible, and in connection with places which they can point out upon a map; of which they have seen the views, and read the accounts written by travellers of our own time. Obedience to, and reliance upon their Heavenly Father is shown to them in action, and they are referred to their own convictions as well as to the experience of others, for the peace and hope which *must* accompany it. Obedience to their earthly parents, and active benevolence are impressed by histories of other children, who thus become their acquaintance, and act upon them as companions.

Many excellent books have been published to aid in this mode of instruction, but we often know not where to meet with the one we want, at the time we want it. How often has a book come to my hands when my use for it was passed, though it was published at the time I had looked for such an one in vain. How many are there probably now published such as I want, but know not where to meet with; and my object in now addressing you, is to ask, if through your medium mothers and teachers could not exchange their knowledge to their great mutual benefit, could not each state what books they are in search of, and what books they have already found valuable in instruction. Perhaps an example will make most clear what I mean, I will therefore begin with my own wishes.

I am in search first of some simple inculcations of the doctrines and duties of religion, devotional or practical, both such as would interest children to read to themselves or to have read to them; suitable either for my own family, or for the children of the poor, and for different ages.

Next any books calculated to render the Scriptures or any part of them, more clear or interesting.

Lastly,—Any history or fiction, inculcating by example one or more religious or moral duties, particularly short stories for young children.

A selection of Tales, inculcating our principal duties, moral and religious, so that all should in turn be clearly conceived and realized by the mind of the child, would be a valuable acquisition to the teachers and visitors of free schools.

Many of these poor children see so little around them to exemplify the precepts we give them, that to supply them with good companions as it were, in books, is of first rate importance. In looking back on my own life, I find many characters in books have had all the effect of real companions, and that from them have I received some of the most actuating impressions of my life. It would be desirable in such a list of books to have not merely the title of a book, but its general contents,—whether Sectarian or not; and if Sectarian, whether that is the spirit of the book, or confined to passages which might be omitted. If a tale the particular moral it enforces;—whether valuable only as a text book for a teacher, or so plain as to be suitable for a monitor to read to a class, or for a child to read to itself; the age too for which it is calculated, the size, price, and publisher.

Perhaps a few examples would best explain.

"*Child's Book on the Soul,*"—256 pages—by Gallaudet.

The object of the first part of this little book is to teach a child the one simple truth, "that it has a soul distinct from the body, superior to it, and which will live for ever."

Robert Stanhope is led by his mother, through a series of simple questions to observe first the qualities of matter, the differences between vegetable and animal life, and between other animals and himself. Then to discriminate the changes produced in a companion by death, and is told that "the something within him which thinks and feels, and knows what is right and wrong, is his *Soul* and will live for ever."

The steps are so complete that a child is led with great interest and pleasure through much of observation on outward objects, and on his inward consciousness, and to more discrimination and close reasoning than previous to experiment on one of six years of age, I should have thought possible. The value of such a beginning of self observation it is unnecessary to point out.

The second part is an answer to Robert's inquiry of what would become of his Soul when it left the body. The answer introduces him to a knowledge of the Great Spirit, his attributes, and of a holy place where all the good will be with him. The fate of the wicked is only alluded to, not dwelt upon. Mrs. Stanhope concludes by telling him of a book containing a letter from his Heavenly Father, which will teach him much more about him. This is a book which interests much, and may be adapted to a great variety of ages and classes, by dwelling on the parts or passing them over quickly, according to the capacity of the reader or hearer.

"*Youth's Natural Theology.*"—Same author. Adapted for educated children from 8 to 12 years of age, or for the higher classes at a free school. This book like the former is distinguished by its clearness and the interest it excites.

"*History of Jonah.*"—Same author. Seely and Burnside. "Designed as an aid to familiar biblical exposition in families and Sunday Schools and Bible Classes," and well fulfilling its object. The only Sectarian part is the application of the Sacrifices of the Old Testament to the Doctrine of the atonement.

"*Manners and Customs of the Israelites.*"—Published by the Kildare Street Society, Dublin. This is a very useful book, and a great favorite when used in classes who are furnished with Bibles, and find the numerous passages referred to. This makes them well acquainted with different parts of the Bible, and keeps up attention and animation. There is one nearly similar published by the Religious Tract Society, but it is more expensive and contains some unnecessary remarks on the Idolatry of Roman Catholics, which the Irish edition is free from. It is published (as well as above 80 other well selected works) bound in leather and lettered, at a low price.

"*Gospel Examples.*"—By J. E. R. Houlston. P. 54. This is a series of short Sermons, three or four pages each; plain and interesting, suited for young Children, either in free schools or at home.

"*Conversations on the Parables.*"—These conversations take place between a Mother Mrs. B. and her children, and are plain, interesting, and not sectarian.

"*The Stranger's Offering;*" or, "*Easy Lessons on the Lord's*

Prayer."—Darton and Harvey. Suited to very young Children, first realizing to them their need of protection, then leading them to ask for it, and giving a few observations on each clause of the Lord's Prayer. There is a single sentence on Sin many will differ from, and one on Angels some will think fanciful. For the poor it requires some omissions, in the enumeration of blessings to be thankful for.

"*Thy Station and its Duties.*"—A school are represented as saying that sentence of the Church Catechism, "To do my duty in that Station of Life, &c.," and questioned upon it, as to the particulars of their duties as scholars, school-fellows, children, &c., and as some are going to service it is extended to their duties as servants in different capacities. It is well done, sensible and interesting.

"*Trials of strength, Moral and Physical.*"—By Mrs. Barwell. Darton and Harvey, 1839. This tale is an account of two boys, George and William Dalton, both well disposed : George the older is a boy of undaunted personal bravery, but deficient in moral courage. William on the contrary is always able to follow steadily the conduct he thinks right, but fails whenever success depends on personal courage.

These different characters, with their advantages and defects, are well and clearly drawn. We meet them first at school when the various forms of moral cowardice are well exposed. The fear of owning himself wrong, or being thought afraid, the dread of ridicule, or of opposing the general opinion, are continually destroying George's peace, and bringing him into disgrace, while his personal courage again raises him in the estimation of his companions, and his own. William on the other hand is generally much respected by his schoolfellows for his quiet pursuance of that course of conduct he thinks right, whatever ridicule or opposition may await it—while his want of presence of mind and courage on occasions of personal enterprize leads to accidents and failures, where courage would have ensured success.

On their return from School their father informs them of his altered circumstances, and that they have no longer the power and influence attending wealth. A visit among some who were formerly equals, opens to the boys a new course of experience, and shows them what advantages they had lost with the loss of fortune, and what were still within their reach. The fear of acknowledging his poverty leads George into much sorrow, and the severe lessons he thence receives, are not lost upon him. While the constant necessity for personal enterprise, attending the life of an emigrant very much overcomes William's habitual weakness and thus both derive not only more improvement but more happiness from their adverse circumstances, than it is probable prosperity would have afforded them.

"*Contributions of Q. Q.*"—Jackson and Walford. This is a collection of pieces contributed by Miss Jane Taylor, under the signature of Q. Q. to the Youth's Magazine. They consist of short Sermons and very valuable Sketches, Conversations and Letters on important points of character and conduct. They are not overdrawn or overstated, and are very interesting to different ages, and though intended for the middle classes there is much that would be useful to all.

"*The Cheap Repository Tracts*" are almost too well known to need mentioning—though if not the earliest, yet among the earliest publications for the poor. They have seldom been surpassed perhaps in clearness, good feeling and good sense. A few contain doctrinal opinions to which some will object, but doctrine has never been the object of the writer, and is seldom prominent; a few contain more evil than I think desirable, but the greater number are very valuable. There are several editions. The Society for promoting Christian Knowledge have published a number of them both as separate Tracts, and as small books with woodcuts in stiff covers.

"*Jesse Allan.*"—An excellent story, showing how Religion can guide and support a young girl through difficulty and suffering. May suit all except the very young. Evangelical, but doctrines not made prominent.

"*Foundling.*"—Large print, good type, 72 pages. A deformed boy, from a foundling Hospital, is brought up as a tailor. The intention of the tale is to show that even to the most destitute, in the "apparent neglect of direct teaching, Providence is raising up teachers in the events of life," and that they shall be led at last to acknowledge the constant guidance and care of their Heavenly Father. The lesson is important, and the tale I think calculated to convey it.

"*What will neighbour Grinaway say.*"—Tract. Houlston. Shows the follies into which we may be led by attending to what others say, instead of the dictates of our own good sense.

A MOTHER.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

I. Letters on Unitarianism. By Henry Hunt Piper.

A clergyman of Sheffield, the Rev. Thomas Best, has been publishing during the last year in the Sheffield Mercury, a Series of Letters, in "refutation" of some "dangerous and deadly errors," which appeared in a Tract of Dr. Channing's, entitled, "Objections to Unitarian Christianity considered." This Tract appears to have been widely circulated in the town, and thus attracted the alarmed attention of the minister of St. James's. The Rev. H. H. Piper of Norton, zealous for the honour of the principles thus impugned, undertook to defend them. His letters were refused admission in the Mercury, but appeared in the Iris. Through twenty-five weeks did this controversy continue—Mr. Best commenting on Dr. Channing's Pamphlet and Unitarian doctrines generally—Mr. Piper commenting on him. The curiosity of the thing is, that Mr. Best professes to take no notice of the letters in the Iris, but to carry on assiduously and exclusively his safe and remote American war—calling, indeed, virtually on Dr. Channing, but remembering the comfortable words of Hotspur—

> "Will he *come* when I do call for him ?"

But once does he confessedly swerve from this course, when he denounces his opponent's letters as containing "quibbles and cavils." But Mr. Piper has been at pains to show that in reality he not only has read, but repeatedly noticed his neighbour's arguments—that in withdrawing his stalwart and ambitious arm from doing fearful battle on the other side of the Atlantic, he has been obliged to pause and survey the entrenchments that were getting up on the Hill Top at Norton. We should scarcely need Mr. Piper's reasons to induce in our own minds the belief that the letter-writer in the Mercury occasionally caught a glance of what was going on in the Iris. This kind of "dignity" is very silly, and deceives nobody.

Wishing that these letters should have more permanent shape, Mr. Piper's friends begged him to collect them into a volume—and here they are before us. It is always a question whether local controversies, possessing, doubtless, the deepest interest to the particular neighbourhoods in which they are carried on, can lay claim to more general notice. But their publication in a separate form is always useful in the immediate vicinity—and often beyond it. It would be well if all that have hitherto been thus published had possessed equal interest with the present series of letters. To be faithful to the special purpose of his writing, Mr. Piper had to follow his opponent wherever that opponent thought proper to wander: so that he had some reason to say at the conclusion of the *eleventh* letter—

> "I entreat you to press more directly towards the mark you first set up, lest we run a race—for I am bound to follow where you lead—a race of such an interminable length, that at the close, no umpire, no spectator will be left to see who first fairly reaches the goal."

We have the old arguments and the old texts brought forward—the old accusations about mutilating the Scriptures—the Improved Version—and Dr. Priestley, revived. In Mr. Piper's treatment of these points there is the greatest ingenuity and perspicacity. He does not forego an approved mode of answering the opponent, because it is an old one, nor prefer a weaker one, merely because it is a newer. On the subject of Dr. Priestley's opinions, too, touching the force of all St. Paul's illustrative arguments and other matters, we are much pleased to see that Mr. P. does not, with most Unitarian writers, *regret* Dr. Priestley's opinions, but *defends* them. When our author is allowed a little rest from the immediate pursuit of his antagonist, he employs it well. We would particularly instance the very admirable letters (Nos. xv. xvi.) on the atonement. It rarely happens, however, but there will be, even in the treatment of an old subject, some striking individual varieties. Mr. Best furnishes us with some which we cannot avoid noticing. The simplicity and reliance with which he is disposed to lean on orthodox authorities in matters beyond his own ken, are remarkable—"the original state of our first parents (which, *according to some orthodox authorities, they retained a day, and no longer*) was, &c."

His mode of interpreting, or rather reading Scripture, too, seems to be unique. "Reading that ancient benediction, (Num. vi. 22, 26) by the light of the new dispensation, it is as follows:—'Jehovah the Father bless thee and keep thee—Jehovah the Son make his face shine upon thee and be gracious unto thee—Jehovah the Holy Ghost lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace.'" It has often been remarked that the explanations of the doctrine of the Trinity, or rather the modes in which it is received, are as various and as opposite as if there were no such doctrine ever distinctly laid down by any church. Mr. Best is very singular in his views on this subject. We merely quote, out of his abundant variations from the common statements of the doctrine, this remarkable assertion, "That there is a sense in which the name of the Father is given to the *whole Deity*. Nor is there anything in the designation of Father—*which is distinctive of one person in the sacred Trinity more than another*." This is surely the *comble de malheurs* to this strangely treated doctrine.

We really think that Mr. Piper has treated his opponent with exemplary forbearance. He says (Introduction, p. xxxiii.)

> "My object was not to expose Mr. Best, but to defend a cause to which I am attached by long association, strengthened by the serious study of nearly forty years; and which has been to me the source of the highest pleasure, and amidst many personal trials has furnished me with the purest consolation; a cause maintaining those scriptural and rational views which enable me to look forward to the completion of the purposes of my Heavenly Father, with regard to the whole human race, with full conviction that all will finally display his glory in the triumphant conclusion of his benevolent purposes as revealed by Christ, gradually to be unfolded more completely in the progress of time, and to be fully displayed when time shall be no more."

The following passage is a brief but seasonable rebuke to the indecent vaunts which are so often made of the superiority of the popular faith as a source of comfort in the hour of death, and to the taunts which are ventured upon in reference to the value of Unitarianism at the same solemn period.

> "It has been my painful lot to witness the last illness of some reputedly orthodox Christians—to know that their attachment to their religion was sincere—to observe them walking a holy, benevolent, upright course, and to see decidedly miserable effects produced as the natural result of their mistaken notions of the peculiar doctrines of the Gospel. Dreadful alarm distressed them lest they should not be of the number of the elect. Fears as to the reality and soundness of their faith haunted them; and doubts about the mercy of God made their *death illness* a painful exhibition of self-inflicted torture. I would sincerely thank God for every instance in which good men of all persuasions escape this sad termination of our brief life; but orthodoxy, when it departs from a supreme regard to 'the pardoning mercy of God—to his universal and parental love—to the doctrine of a resurrection and immortality,' modified by the conduct of this present life, but eventually, *in all cases*, destined to display the unbounded goodness, power, and wisdom of God, has nothing but what is the ground of fallacious hope, and may be the source, in the most amiable minds, of the most distressing and tormenting fears."—*Letters*, p. 254.

II. Geraldine—a Tale of Conscience.

Perhaps this is the first Novel which the Christian Teacher has been called upon to notice. But let not our readers be surprised. It is no ordinary Novel. By which, however, we would not have it supposed that we esteem it a remarkably good one, but it has the somewhat peculiar quality of being a religious Novel, and the still more peculiar quality of being a Catholic Novel. We notice it because it is a symptom of the efforts which the Catholics of Britain are making to recommend their ancient form of faith to the regards of Protestants. They are cheered by the unexpected aid from the banks of the Isis,—and do not wish to be behind-hand in seconding the exertions so disinterestedly made in their behalf by their late rebellious brethren of the Church of England. Geraldine represents the process by which a young lady of good family and good education becomes from a Protestant a Catholic. The discussions carried on in the two first volumes are well, often admirably, supported. The uncle, the warden, is a living picture of a good High Churchman. Miss Graham, a clever, fearless Scotch girl, defends the simplicity of Presbyterianism against the mysticism and form of Catholicism and Church-of-England-ism, with the most successful raillery and humour. Mr. Everard—a perfect specimen of refined Jesuitism—stands apparently midway between the Protestant and Catholic Faith, but really with a leaning so decidedly towards the latter, as to make his seeming candour only the more dangerous. On the whole there is great talent in the two first volumes. They represent Catholicism (and it is a good sign of the times) in a moderate and not uninteresting point of view—explaining away difficulties, and softening down objectionable features. Do not think us very bold, reader, in recommending you to look into this enticing book, for if you will only go on from the two first volumes to the third, no danger to your convictions need be apprehended. If the two first volumes should hoodwink you a little, the last will so manifestly try to blind you outright, that you will toss it indignantly aside. The bane and the antidote are before you. The last volume is perverted enough, to do mischief, if it were not too weak to deceive anybody.

III. The Works of William E. Channing, D. D., 4 vols. 12mo. Third Edition. Glasgow: James Hedderwick and Son, 1840.

It is not our intention to speak of the writings of Dr. Channing, but of the Glasgow edition of his Works. It comes out under the Author's own auspices, and is, in every respect, the fullest and the handsomest that has appeared, either in America or in this country.

The Edition is not absolutely complete,—some publications of Dr. Channing having appeared too late to be inserted, and some minor pieces being omitted,—"the classification adopted not admitting of their being included with propriety in any of the volumes now published." The Publishers pledge themselves to issue a fifth volume, as soon as the materials shall be sufficiently ample. May they have to add another and another.

We are tempted to extract the Author's Preface, which is only too brief.

"The Author is unwilling that this Edition should appear, without expressing his great pleasure at the favourable reception which his writings have met in Great Britain. He is aware that this is no sure sign of the truth or importance of his views. But when works of a grave character, written from the heart, and with no reference to popular opinion, make their way among strangers, unaided by any efforts to promote their circulation, the presumption is, that they are not wholly lifeless traditions, but that they answer in a measure to some real and enduring want of our nature.

"These volumes will show that the Author feels strongly the need of deep and social changes, of a spiritual revolution in Christendom, of a new bond between man and man, of a new sense of the relation between man and his Creator. At the same time they will shew his firm belief, that our present low civilization, the central idea of which is wealth, cannot last for ever; that the mass of men are not doomed hopelessly and irresistibly to the degradation of mind and heart in which they are now sunk; that a new comprehension of the end and dignity of a human being is to remodel social institutions and manners; that in Christianity and in the powers and principles of human nature, we have the promise of something holier and happier than now exists. It is a privilege to live in this faith, and a privilege to communicate it to others. The author is not without hope, that he may have strength for some more important labours; but if disappointed in this, he trusts, that these writings which may survive him a little time, will testify to his sympathy with his fellow creatures, and to his faith in God's great purposes towards the human race.

"He will only add, that this Edition is the only complete and correct collection of what he has hitherto published. It contains all such of his writings, up to this time, as he wishes to appear under his name."

THE
CHRISTIAN TEACHER.

Art. I.—THE NATURE AND DESIGN OF CHRISTIANITY INVESTIGATED FROM AN ANALYSIS OF ITS PRIMITIVE RECORDS, CONTAINED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

No. II.—The Retrospect of the Ministry of Jesus in the Gospel of John.

I.

"And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name." (John xx. 30, 31.) These words have been regarded by many commentators, on internal grounds, as the original termination of the Gospel of John; what follows in the twenty-first chapter being supposed to be a kind of sequel added afterwards, as preserving an interesting tradition of Christ's language respecting two of his most eminent disciples.*

I have placed them here, as distinctly indicating in the language of the author himself the object of his Gospel, and consequently furnishing us with the best key to its right interpretation. He says very plainly, that it was not his intention to exhibit a full account of all the wonderful works of Jesus, but rather to make such a selection of them, as might most effectually accomplish the didactic purpose which he had immediately in view.

In the fearless range of that searching scepticism, which has distinguished theological inquiry in some parts of Europe during the last half century,—and which, whatever may in some instances have been its immediate effects, we have no reason to doubt, will be found ultimately to have served the cause of religious truth,—it was to be expected, that the Gospel of John, from its marked and peculiar character, and the different view which it seems to give of the ministry of Jesus from the three first Evangelists, would not escape a very critical interrogation or even a direct attack. Accordingly, critics have not been wanting in modern times, who have called in question its authenticity.[*] Into the controversy on this point, it would be foreign to our immediate object to enter now. Upon all inquiries, which are external to the New Testament itself, we shall be better able to form an opinion, when we have first possessed ourselves of a clear and accurate idea of its various contents. One fact seems universally admitted by both parties in this controversy, that the work, which bears among us the name of John, comes down from the earliest ages of Christianity, and, before the close of the second century, was acknowledged by the Catholic Church as a genuine production of the Apostle. As a general introduction therefore to our proposed analysis of this Gospel, I shall simply recite the prevailing tradition of the Church respecting its author, and the time, place and occasion of its composition, at the period referred to, viz. the close of the second century.

---

* Grotius supposed the last chapter to be an addition made after the death of the apostle by the elders of the Church of Ephesus (*in loc.*). Later critics, without adopting his explanation of its origin, have agreed with him in doubting its authenticity; Le Clerc, Semler, Paulus, Bertholdt, Lücke, De Wette. See *De Wette's Einleitung ins* N. T. § 112.

The author of the Gospel, according to this tradition, was a Galilæan fisherman, one of the sons of Zebedee, and an early follower of Jesus. His elder brother James[†] and Simon Peter formed with himself the select few, out of the twelve, whom Jesus admitted to more confidential intercourse, and allowed to be witnesses of scenes and transactions from which the rest were excluded. From indications in the Gospels, it would appear, that his temper was ardent and affectionate, but tinctured with ambition and inclined by nature to be vindictive and intolerant. These tendencies, which we may conclude were subsequently mellowed down by the influence of the Christian spirit, and which contained in themselves the ground-work of great excellence of character, did not hinder Jesus from distinguishing him by peculiar marks of regard and attachment.[‡] Between our Lord and the Apostle a sort of personal friendship seems to have

[*] Particularly Bretschneider; '*Probabilia de Evangel. et Epistol. Joan. Apost. indole et origine.*' Men however of great learning and of a liberal spirit have opposed his conclusions; e. g. besides Lücke, De Wette and Usteri. It is said that Bretschneider himself has modified his original opinions on the subject. A brief review of the principal arguments on both sides of this question may form the subject of a future paper.

[†] His name always occurs first when the two are mentioned together.

[‡] If the tradition preserved by Irenæus (Adv. Hær. 3. 3.) of his behaviour to Cerinthus in a public bath at Ephesus, may be relied on as a fact, the tendencies of his early life do not appear to have been wholly corrected at an advanced age.—(See *Lücke's Commentar. Einleitung*, § 2. *Leben und Character des Ap. Johannes.*) He was afraid the walls of the building would fall on him in the company of such an enemy to the truth. The disposition implied in this anecdote is akin to that recorded by Luke ix. 54.

subsisted, which, according to the Gospel ascribed to the latter, was expressed in a very marked manner on two occasions; by John's occupying the place of honour next to Christ himself at the last supper; and still more by our Lord's touching commendation of his mother to the care of that disciple, from the Cross. In the earlier part of the Book of Acts, we find frequent mention of him in connexion with Peter: after which time he vanishes from the scene, his name never occurring in the records of the ministry, or in the writings, of Paul. It has been supposed by some writers, that he remained in Jerusalem till the death of the mother of Jesus. All this is mere conjecture. Less doubt attaches to the generally received tradition, that he removed in after life to Ephesus, and presided to his death over a Christian community in that city, of which the foundations had been already laid by the preaching of Paul. At what time this removal to Ephesus took place there are no data for ascertaining. The few facts furnished by the New Testament are only negatively determinative. John could not have been at Ephesus at the time of Paul's last visit to that city (Acts xix. xx.); otherwise the Book of Acts would hardly have omitted to notice the presence of so distinguished an apostle in that region; and Paul, according to a rule, which he appears to have laid down for his own guidance (Rom. xv. 20.), would not have felt himself justified in breaking in upon the sphere of another man's ministry. Neither could he have been there, when Paul addressed his second letter to Timothy at Ephesus; for in that case the relations of the young minister to the Church must have been different from those which are indicated in the letter. When Paul reached Jerusalem on his last journey, previous to his being sent prisoner to Rome, John seems to have already left that city, no mention occurring in Acts (xxi. 18.) of any of the apostles, except James; but whether for a time only or permanently, it is impossible to say. Upon the whole, it is most probable that John did not take up his abode in Ephesus, till the original connexion of Paul and his associates with that neighbourhood had wholly ceased.* In this city it was the general belief of the early Church, that he lived to a very advanced age, and even survived the close of the first century. A tradition, generally received among the Fathers, but founded apparently on a passage in the Apocalypse (i. 9.),† states the Apostle to have been banished for some time to the isle of Patmos, but afterwards restored to Ephesus.

Of the other writings ascribed to John an opportunity will occur of speaking hereafter: with regard to his Gospel—the time of its composition has been assigned, with great unanimity of opinion, to the latter period of his life, when he resided among the Greeks of Asia, but whether in Patmos or at Ephesus is uncertain. The occasion of its composition has been variously conjectured. Irenæus affirmed that it was written to counteract the errors of Cerinthus and the Nicolaitans, which exhibited an early development of the Gnostic system; others have supposed, that it was directed against the Judaizing teachers, who opposed so pertinaciously the ministry of Paul; while a third party have imagined, that they discerned in it a reference to the disciples of the Baptist, who appear to have formed a separate community of believers for some time after the commencement of the preaching of the Gospel.* It is not unlikely, that all these erroneous tendencies, which were already existing in the infant Church of Asia, might have some influence in determining the peculiar view of Christ's person and ministry, which distinguishes the Gospel of John: but to assume any one of them as the immediate incentive to its composition, and to construct the meaning of particular passages by a prominent reference to it,—is to bring a preconceived opinion to the study of the Gospel, and to prevent our receiving a fair and impartial impression of its general object and character.

---

* See *Lücke, Commentar. Einleit.*

† Compare *Lücke ubi supra* with *De Wette Einl.* N. T. § 108.

Irenæus, who flourished in the second half of the second century, is the first Christian writer who distinctly quotes this Gospel, as the work of the Apostle John. Polycarp and Papias, who are said to have seen John in their youth, and who quote from his first Epistle, furnish no allusion to his Gospel; in the other apostolic Fathers the supposed references to it are very vague and uncertain: but from the time of Irenæus, the opinion, that the Gospel bearing the name of John is really his production, has remained generally unquestioned, till a comparatively recent period.

II.

Like the three first Gospels, the form and character of that of John imply the existence of a traditional knowledge of the person and ministry of Jesus, among the parties to whom it was immediately addressed. It is evidently not a work intended to communicate for the first time all information on the subject. But, although agreeing thus far, there is between John and the other Evangelists,—quite independent of their frequent differences in arranging the order of events and in the insertion or omission of particular transactions,—a very great and striking diversity in their whole mode of conceiving and exhibiting the ministry of Christ. The style of the Synoptical Gospels is,—if I may be allowed, for the sake of brevity, to borrow a term from the philosophical vocabulary of a neighbouring nation,—eminently *objective;* they describe events and scenes, and set down discourses and aphorisms, just as they occurred to the memory, or had been handed down by word of mouth, without reasoning or reflection, leaving them to produce their own impression on the mind of the reader. They are plainly depositories of the popular tradition, diffused by the preaching of the earliest missionaries; of which the groundwork at least must have consisted, in the first instance, of a plain and simple recital of the actions and discourses of the prophet of Nazareth. The instructions of Jesus were so intermingled and identified with his character and his life, that his doctrine could hardly be separated by the first preachers from his biography; and this circumstance no doubt determined the form of many of the earliest memorials of Christianity.

---

* *De Wette*, *Einl.* N. T. § 107: who gives the following extracts from the Clementine Recognitions illustrative of the independence and pretensions of this sect; 'ex discipulis Johannis, qui videbantur esse magni, segregarunt se a populo et magistrum suum veluti Christum prædicarunt'—'ecce unus ex discipulis Johannis affirmabat, Christum Johannem fuisse et non Jesum.' The modern Zabians, who have recently attracted the attention of Orientalists, cannot be certainly shown to have any historical connexion with this more ancient sect.

On the other hand, the Gospel of John,—to avail myself again of a foreign mode of expression,—is intensely *subjective;* i. e. the author contemplates every event and discourse, which he records, through the medium of his own feelings and convictions, imbues them, as it were, with the colours of his own mind, and sometimes appears to become, almost unconsciously and without any warning to his reader, the exponent or continuator of trains of thought and sentiment, of which the form and professed object of his narrative would have led us to regard him as the simple historian. It has been observed in commendation of the work of John, as compared with the other Gospels, that it gives us more of the mind of Jesus; and, in a certain sense, this may be true. The intimate familiarity of John with Christ, the habitual contact of their minds, and the quick and earnest sympathy with which he seems to have entered into the profound spiritual significance of his master's lessons, are doubtless a guarantee—admitting the authenticity of the Gospel—for the fidelity with which he has transmitted to us his own impressions of those lessons; but the very warmth and susceptibility of his temperament render it probable, that he has deeply impressed his own individuality on the form, in which they have been conveyed to us, and that in this Gospel the divine wisdom of Jesus, —the essential identity of which with that exhibited by the

Synoptical Evangelists I in no wise mean to deny,—still shines through the medium of the mind of John.[*] Nor is there anything unpleasing, or embarrassing to a healthful faith, in this view of the relation of John's Gospel to the real, historical Christ. Mind is the only vehicle and interpreter of mind. But there are minds and characters, which have many sides and require various interpreters, and the lustre of whose qualities may be transmitted to distant times and countries through many different media. Such pre-eminently were the mind and character of Jesus. We form a more enlarged conception of the depth, the richness and the variety of his moral relations to men and God, and of the adaptation of his wisdom to the diversified wants and capacities of human character, by having them revealed to us under various aspects, and blended with the warm and living sympathies of different temperaments, than if his life and doctrine had been exhibited once for all in a single type of objective delineation.

A parallel case to that of Jesus is furnished by the history of Socrates. It is well known, that the illustrious founder of moral science among the Greeks left no writings behind him; and that whatever knowledge we now possess of his mind comes to us through the representations of his disciples. But the two most distinguished of these disciples have so completely addressed themselves to opposite sides of his philosophical system, or have so deeply modified their exposition of it by the individuality of their respective minds,—that it has formed the subject of one of the subtlest investigations of modern learning to find out the common principle that connects these opposite views with the source from which they are both professedly derived.[†] Of the tendency of a recording, to flow into, and mingle itself with, a recorded, mind, we have a curious instance in the literary history of Coleridge. In one of his works he had proposed to give extracts from the writings of Archbishop Leighton:[‡] but in transcribing passages from that author his own mind kindled into so vivid and creative a sympathy with him, that he fell spontaneously into composition, continuing and expanding the thought which had been suggested to him in the mechanical task of making extracts, but without giving his reader, in every instance, a distinct intimation, where Leighton ends and Coleridge begins.* I cannot better illustrate the kind of relation, which appears to have subsisted between the mind of Jesus and that of John in the Gospel before us, and which furnishes perhaps the best explanation of its peculiar character.

---

[*] Thus much is fully conceded by Lücke himself, who is a very zealous assertor of the genuineness and canonical authority of John's Gospel, in an interesting note on the intercessory prayer of Jesus. (John xvii.)

[†] See a Paper of Schleiermacher's, '*On the Worth of Socrates as a Philosopher*,' (from the *Berlin Transactions* of 1815) translated in the *Philological Museum*, vol. ii. p. 538.

[‡] '*Aids to Reflection*.'—See the singular and very characteristic Advertisement prefixed to the work.

Although the historical form, into which the earliest records of Christianity had been cast, and which was a natural result of the origin and character of the religion, rendered it inconvenient, and perhaps impossible, for the apostle to discard it altogether, yet it is plain, from its commencement and from various expressions which occur in the course of it, that his Gospel is essentially of a dogmatic and apologetic character,—that it is a vindication of the dignity and authority of Christ against those who were disposed to dispute or misconceive them,—and that it retains only so much of the historical as is necessary to furnish a groundwork for this properly didactic object.—It would be not unaptly described, as an *Apologetic Retrospect* of the ministry of Jesus. We discern in it already the tendency which afterwards became so powerful in the church, towards the construction of a definite dogmatic system. Coming into existence at a later date than the original materials, out of which the three first Gospels are formed, and the production of one mind, roused to a continuous effort of composition by the controversial excitements, which were acting upon it,—it may be regarded as marking the first stage of the transition from the simple historical records, which originally set forth the life and teachings of Jesus, and laid the foundations of a popular Christianity throughout the world, to that more elaborate definition of doctrine and construction of speculative theories, which distinguished the theological literature of a later period, and which must strike the unprejudiced inquirer as one of the most remarkable features in the historical development of Christianity.

III.

Although, according to this view, the historical constitutes a subordinate element in the Gospel of John, yet it becomes necessary to notice the order, in which he arranges the events of our Lord's ministry referred to by him, that we may form a clearer idea of the relation of his narrative to that of the three first Evangelists. To attempt to harmonize the two narratives in the present stage of our inquiries would be foreign to the object, already explained, for which this analysis has been undertaken. It will be recollected, that I showed in the first paper of this Series, that the Synoptical Gospels divide the whole of Christ's public ministry into two great periods, very nearly separated from each other by the transfiguration;—that which he spent in Galilee; and that which, commencing with his journey southward on occasion of the feast of the Passover, terminated with his death and resurrection. Within the limits of these two periods the three first Evangelists comprise the entire life of Jesus after his entrance on the prophetic office, recording only one feast and one visit to Jerusalem. John, on the other hand, who obviously does not aim at chronological exactness, and who seems to mention events only as the foundation of some important doctrinal inference, or as they suggested themselves to his memory in connexion with the discourse, of which they were the occasion,—represents Jesus continually interchanging Galilee with Judea from the first, as the scene of his ministry,—and speaks of several festivals as the cause of his visiting Jerusalem.

---

* In some of the extracts marked L. and E. the thoughts of the two are avowedly mingled into each other.

The following is a brief outline of the order of events recorded by him. The public life of Jesus, described by John, opens as in the other three Evangelists with the ministry of the Baptist; who, not previously knowing Jesus, recognized him as the Christ by the descent of the Spirit, and openly addressed him as the Lamb of God, which was to take away the sin of the world. Two of Christ's earliest followers, of whom Andrew was one, were already disciples of John the Baptist. After his baptism, no mention being made of the temptation, Jesus withdraws into Galilee; and on the third day after his arrival, performs his first miracle at a marriage feast at Cana, by turning water into wine. Not continuing at Cana, he proceeds with his mother, brethren and disciples to Capernaum; but, in consequence of the approach of the Passover, soon quits that town, and goes up to Jerusalem. During this first visit and in the very commencement of his ministry, — when, according to the other Evangelists, he studiously shunned publicity and seemed anxious to keep his extraordinary powers in the back ground,—John places the singular transaction of the expulsion of the money-changers from the Temple, which the Synoptical Gospels postpone to a later period, only a few days before his apprehension and death. Whilst he remains in Jerusalem, Jesus is secretly consulted by Nicodemus, a member of the Sanhedrim; and afterwards returns northward again into the neighbourhood, where John was still baptizing; and where, a dispute having arisen between the disciples of John and a certain Jew[*] who followed Jesus, the Baptist repeats his testimony to the divine authority of Christ. From this region he pursues his route circuitously[†] towards Galilee through Samaria, where he discourses with a woman of Sychar, and makes many proselytes. Arrived in Galilee, he goes again to Cana, and there cures at a distance the son of a certain nobleman, who was sick at Capernaum. Another feast of the Jews, which is not further defined, but which is supposed from its position in the narrative to be that of Pentecost, again takes him up to Jerusalem, where he heals the infirm man at the pool of Bethesda, and engages in earnest controversy with the Jews. Immediately afterwards, without any account of the intervening journey, we find him again in Galilee, where he feeds five thousand with five loaves and two small fishes, and walks upon the waters of the sea of Tiberias by night. The feast of Tabernacles follows, to which he goes up secretly for fear of the Jews. About the middle of this feast, Jesus began to teach in the Temple, commencing his labours early in the morning and retiring at night to the Mount of Olives. During this visit to Jerusalem, Jesus is engaged in incessant controversy with the Jewish doctors, and cures the man who had been blind from his birth. He seems to have remained in Jerusalem over the feast of Dedication; when, having provoked the wrath of the Jews, he withdraws for safety beyond the Jordan, to the place where John had formerly baptized, and where great numbers resort to him and believe. From this retirement, he comes forth to raise his friend Lazarus from the dead. This event and the interest which it excites still further exasperate the leading members of the Sanhedrim, who determine to put him to death. To escape these dangers, he takes up his abode in a city called Ephraim on the borders of the wilderness. Six days before the last Passover, Jesus is entertained at supper in Bethany, Lazarus, whom he had raised from the dead, being one of the guests, Martha serving, and Mary anointing his feet with spikenard and wiping them with her hair. Many Jews are attracted to Bethany by the strong curiosity they felt to see Lazarus as well as Jesus; insomuch that the priests, perceiving the service he rendered to the cause of Christ, resolve that Lazarus should share the fate of his Lord. From Bethany Jesus makes a triumphal entry into Jerusalem, the interest and enthusiasm manifested towards him on this occasion by the multitudes being mainly ascribed by John to the impression produced by his miracle of raising Lazarus.

---

[*] The majority of the best MSS. read 'Ιουδαίου instead of 'Ιουδαίων; and Griesbach and Lachmann have accordingly admitted it into the text. It certainly gives a more natural and graphic character to the narrative.

[†] Compare, in the different commentators on John iii. 23, the geographical indications of Eusebius and Jerome respecting Ænon and Salim, where John was baptizing; which it is difficult to reconcile with the use of ἔδει. John iv. 4.

The account in John's Gospel of the last days of Christ's public ministry in Jerusalem differs in several particulars from that of the other three. Mention is made of certain Greeks[*] that had come up to worship at the feast, and who having heard of the fame of Jesus were desirous of being introduced to him. This circumstance gives occasion to a beautiful remark of Jesus. Discourses, of which no trace exists in the Synoptical Gospels, occur in every part of that of John. It must be noticed, that neither the transfiguration, nor the institution of the Lord's supper, nor the agony in the garden, are mentioned by John; though there is a passage (ch. xii. 27, 28), which seems to me to combine in itself the double significance of the agony and the transfiguration: 'Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour: but for this cause came I unto this hour. Father, glorify thy name. Then came there a voice from heaven, saying, I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again.' At the supper, of which our Lord partook with his disciples, just before his sufferings, but which, according to John's account, could not have been the paschal supper,[†] Jesus inculcates humility by the symbolical act of washing his disciples' feet; in the same spirit, and for the same purpose, that we find him in the Synoptical Gospels, when he first begins distinctly to announce his future fate, holding up a young child to the imitation of his followers. After supper, Jesus delivers a discourse of great pathos and solemnity, unfolding the principles and prospects of his religion, and extending through several chapters; at the conclusion of which he retires with his disciples across the brook Cedron to his usual place of nocturnal resort among the gardens of Mount Olivet. In this retreat he is discovered and apprehended. In accordance with the uniform aim of John to maintain throughout his narrative the superhuman dignity of Christ, we may observe that he represents the officers going backward and falling to the ground, as if awestruck, when they hear the solemn words, by which Jesus usually expressed his Messianic character and authority, 'I am he.' John speaks of himself, as present with Jesus through the whole course of his trial, accompanying him to the cross, and witnessing with his own eyes the water and blood that issued from the side pierced by the spear. Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus, men of rank and wealth, both members of the Sanhedrim, and disciples of Christ, superintend his embalming and burial. Mary Magdalene is the first to discover, on the first day of the week, that the stone has been rolled away from the mouth of the sepulchre. She communicates the fact to Peter and John, who go to the sepulchre, and find that Jesus is actually risen. Nothing can be more graphic—more vividly impressed with all the outward marks of truth, than this account by John himself of his own and Peter's examination of the sepulchre, and of the conviction produced in them of the reality of the resurrection. Jesus shows himself first to Mary Magdalene. She does not at once recognize him; but when he addresses her by name with the familiar tones of his affectionate voice, her belief is instantaneous and complete. Twice afterwards he appears to his disciples, and on the last occasion convinces the incredulous Thomas by the ocular and tangible proof of his hands and side. In these last interviews with his disciples after his resurrection, Jesus conveys to them his promised gift of peace, and by breathing on them imparts the Holy Spirit.* Such are the principal events of the ministry of Jesus recorded by John; the 21st chapter being, as I have already stated, in all probability a later addition.

---

[*] Lücke understands here 'proselytes of the gate,' those who are called *σεβόμενοι προσήλυτοι* (Acts xiii. 43 and elsewhere), converts from heathenism to the monotheism of the Jews. Proper Jews, speaking the Greek language, would have been called 'Hellenists.'

[†] At the time of Christ's being brought to Pilate for judgment, (John xix. 14,) it was only the preparation of the Passover; the feast itself therefore must have coincided with the Sabbath, during which the body lay in the grave, whereas the three first Evangelists affirm distinctly, that the Passover occurred *before* the crucifixion, and that Christ celebrated it with his disciples at the last supper. This is one of the greatest discrepancies between the account of John and that of the Synoptical Gospels.

IV.

Upon this ground-work of fact is erected the system of dogmatic instruction, which we must regard as the author's main object in the composition of his gospel. This instruction is conveyed either in the direct didactic addresses of Jesus to his disciples, or in his controversial dialogues with the Jews. To analyse all these passages as they occur, and state the result, would obviously carry us beyond the limits within which such a paper as the present must be confined, and would not perhaps after all leave a very distinct impression of the doctrinal system of John. I shall endeavour therefore to embrace under certain general heads, the most important features of his views respecting the person and ministry of Christ.

---

* The words *εἰρήνη ὑμῖν*, with which Christ enters the assembly of his disciples (John xx. 19—23.), might perhaps be considered as the customary salutation, the *Shalam* of the East; but as the words are solemnly repeated, and immediately followed by the communication of the Spirit, they appear to me to have an obvious reference to John xiv. 27, where the bequest of peace also occurs in immediate connexion with the promise of the Comforter. Christ's breathing on his disciples is evidently intended by John to be considered as the fulfilment of the promise of the holy Spirit (John xiv. 16, 26), which was to qualify the disciples for the discharge of their ministry in the personal absence of their Lord. It is the doctrine of John's Gospel, that the Spirit was to be communicated after Jesus was glorified (John vii. 39.); and this δοξα, we may conclude from Christ's own language (John viii. 31, xvii. 1—5.), was to commence with his death and resurrection. Luke (Acts i. ii.) following a different account, has postponed the effusion of the Spirit till after Christ's ascension (of which John gives no account) and final separation from his followers.

The dogmatic character of the work is plainly announced in the language of the celebrated proem, concerning the divine word or logos. This great and distinguishing idea the author places in the very front of his gospel; he speaks of the logos as becoming incarnate, and fixing his tabernacle among men:* and though the logos is never referred to again in the same decided terms as in the proem, yet throughout the gospel there is an implied reference to it, which appears to me to tinge all the language of John, and to furnish the best explanation of the efficacy directly attached by him to faith, of the intimate union affirmed to subsist between Christ and God, and of the necessity of being born again of the spirit to be prepared for life eternal. Great difference of opinion has existed among theologians as to the real nature and office of this divine word. Without enumerating here the various theories which have been proposed respecting it, I will simply observe, that the history, which has now been very learnedly and satisfactorily traced,† of the progressive changes of signification attached to the term logos among the different branches of the Jewish nation, and the striking coincidence of many forms of expression in this gospel of John with the known phraseology of the philosophical school of Alexandria,—seem to me to prove beyond all reasonable question, that among the philosophical conceptions prevalent in the east at the time of our Saviour's appearance, we must look for its true interpretation, and that what it meant among the writers from whom it has been borrowed,—as it has nowhere been otherwise defined,—it must mean in John by whom it has been adopted.

When the Hebrews abandoned the grosser anthropomorphism of their early faith, and began to entertain more spiritual conceptions of God, they still felt the want of some intervening idea, by which they might realise to the ordinary apprehensions of men the nature and operations of the invisible deity, and mark, as it were, the mode of transition from the world of spirit to the world of sense. They naturally turned to their own minds for illustration. They found in the free combination of their own ideas, and in the purposes and volitions thence arising, the hidden and primitive source of power and action; and in speech, which embodies thought and makes it intelligible to the sense, they discerned the instrument, by which mind acts upon the external world. Speech therefore seemed to them the natural link between the spiritual and the material worlds,—so closely allied to mind as to be supposed to be of a kindred nature, and yet so dependant on material functions as clearly to fall within the jurisdiction of the world of sense.* Under these circumstances, the term Word or Speech presented itself to their minds, as a suitable expression for the divine power,—that attribute of God, by which he acts on the visible universe, by which he creates and governs all things. In this sense, the term Word, and kindred forms of expression, occur every where in the Old Testament. 'By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth.' (Ps. xxxiii. 6.) The successive effects of creation are ascribed in Genesis to the energy of the divine word. It is unnecessary to multiply examples.† I would remark in general, that there has always been a tendency in the oriental forms of speculation to personify and *hypostatize*‡ abstract ideas, *i. e.*, to invest them with an existence independent of the mind, in which they dwell. This tendency betrays itself even in the monotheistic philosophy of the Hebrews; and during their captivity they were brought under influences, which quickened and confirmed it. The religion of Zoroaster, which at that time prevailed in Upper Asia, and had been raised into increased influence and authority under the sway of the Medo-Persian Kings, recognized the Word§ as the creating principle of the Universe, and gave it a substance and individuality, which were but faintly ascribed to it in the earlier personifications of the Hebrews. The whole Jewish theology,—still preserving its great fundamental principle of monotheism, and the Messianic anticipations of the prophets which were founded on it,—underwent a new development in the interval between the captivity and the birth of Christ. Some of the stages of this development are preserved in the apocryphal writings of the Old Testament, produced during this interval; and the careful study of these writings furnishes many valuable aids towards a right understanding of the phraseology of Christian times.

---

* *σὰρξ ἐγένετο, καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν* (i. 14.). Wisdom is personified and spoken of in similar terms, in a passage of Ecclesiasticus referred to by Lücke, (xxiv. 8.) **ὁ κτίσας με κατέπαυσε τὴν σκηνήν μου, καὶ εἶπεν, Ἐν Ἰακὼβ κατασκήνωσον.**

† See Lücke's *Geschichtliche Erörterung der Logosidee* prefixed to his Commentary; the general results of which appear to me to be altogether confirmed by Professor Norton's learned illustrations of the Doctrine of the Logos, in the 10th Section of his Statement of Reasons for not believing the Doctrines of Trinitarians.

---

*It is hardly necessary to remark that λόγος in Greek, like the old English word Discourse (used in its logical sense), expresses both an operation of reasoning and speech.

† Illustrations of the use of the term Word, to express the divine power and operations, have been collected from the Old Testament, though with a more doctrinal application than belongs immediately to the present inquiry, by the Rev. Wm. Johns of Manchester, in his learned Essay on the proem to John's Gospel, p. 3 et seqq. with Note VI. in the Appendix.

‡ Personification is the first, and *hypostasis* the last, stage of the process.—

§ The *Honover* of the Zend-Avesta was invoked and adored as the living self-existent Word, the medium of communication between Ormuzd and the world.—See the *Heilige Sage*, &c.—*des Zendvolks von J. G. Rhode.*

In the course of the three centuries, which immediately preceded the age of Christ, causes had come into operation, which produced a deep and lasting effect on the moral and intellectual condition of the then civilized world. The conquests of Alexander and the extensive colonization which accompanied them had brought the Grecian and the Oriental minds into immediate contact, and occasioned an intermingling of their respective qualities. Both lost something of their individuality by this union; and the result was a compound of ideas and principles, or rather perhaps of mental tendencies, which worked as a deep leaven in the constitution of the moral civilization of many ensuing centuries. In the language and conceptions of the apocryphal writings, we can already trace some of the influences of Grecian philosophy, without the abandonment of that tendency to personification and *hypostasis*, which is essentially Oriental. In these writings, we find the Wisdom of God, or the ethical personification of his nature and attributes, taking the place of the simpler Word of the Old Testament, which expresses the idea of his Power; and this personification already tending towards a precision and consistency, which seem properly to belong to an existence individually distinct from God. But the circumstance, which exercised the greatest influence on the religious ideas of a numerous class of the Hebrew nation, and gave to all the tendencies, of which I have spoken, their complete and final development, was the foundation of the schools of Alexandria, and the encouragement given by the Greek kings of Egypt to the settlement of Jewish colonists in that city. Here, under the patronage of an enlightened court and the liberalizing influences of an extended commerce, Jewish Rabbis were brought into daily intercourse with Greek Sophists; and the simple, popular monotheism of Moses and the prophets was compared and combined with the subtle speculations of the schools of Athens. Of all the productions of Grecian wisdom, the writings of Plato had the greatest affinity with the speculations of the East; and he had many devoted followers in Alexandria both among the heathens and the Jews. Of this latter class was the celebrated Philo, who carried these *hypostatizing* tendencies to the farthest limit compatible with monotheism, and who appears to have aimed at a systematic combination of the religion of the Old Testament with the philosophy of Plato. We have occasion to notice here only so much of his speculations, as bears upon our present subject.

In the mind of Philo, the native Hebrew ideas of the word of God, the holy spirit, and the wisdom of God, appear to have been fused down into one vague and general conception of the Divine energy in its various relations to created existence, and this conception again to have been crystallized, as it were, under the influences of an exotic philosophy, into the sharply-defined form of the *hypostatic* logos;—but with so much fluctuation and uncertainty in his own views, that he sometimes speaks of the logos as a simple agency of God, and sometimes as a distinct person,—according as the different elements, of which his system was compounded, the monotheistic or the philosophical, had the ascendancy for the time being in his thoughts.[*] According to Philo, the logos was the oldest creation of God, not indeed like God, unbegotten, but still not created like finite beings,—the first born and only begotten of the Eternal Father, —the image of God,—the creator of the world, impressing upon it, as with a seal,[†] its form and properties,—the revealed name of God,—the link between God and the world, at once separating and uniting them,[‡]—the highest angel,—the second God,— the high priest, the propitiator, advocate and intercessor for mankind,—more particularly, the being, whose energy and operations were manifested to the world in the history of the Jewish nation, and to whom all the divine forms and appearances mentioned in the Old Testament were to be referred.[§] Owing to the vague and fluctuating language, to which I have alluded as distinguishing this mystical school, it is often difficult to determine, when they are merely personifying an idea, and when they are speaking of a real existence; but the critics who have most deeply studied the writings of Philo, incline to the opinion, that he regarded the Word as a being distinct from God, though dependent on him,—and Professor Lücke, differing in this particular from Dr. Priestley, thinks that he probably associated the expectation of its appearance under some form or other with the fulfilment of the Messianic hopes.* The age of Philo coincided with that of the apostles; and his writings, which were but the expression of principles of thought that had been long in operation, were extensively read, and exerted a powerful influence among the more cultivated classes of his countrymen. The intermixture of Jews from all parts of the world at the annual festivals in Jerusalem tended to diffuse among them a common public opinion, and to circulate the ideas of their most distinguished teachers even amongst the people. It is not therefore necessary to suppose, that John had actually studied the writings of Philo, (though even for this he might have found opportunities in the latter years of his life) to account for the remarkable coincidence between their modes of conception and their forms of speech. The ardent and susceptible mind of John readily imbibed the speculative tendencies that were floating around it on every side; and cast the deep moral and spiritual impulse, that had been given to it by affectionate communion with Jesus, into the forms which those tendencies naturally shaped and directed. During his residence of many years in the cultivated and philosophical city of Ephesus, in the midst of Hellenistic Jews, and surrounded by the fermenting elements of oriental theosophy and Grecian speculation, he must have become thoroughly conversant with the principles, which had at that time the greatest influence and currency in the Græco-Asiatic world, and have felt himself impelled, as well by the moral necessities of his position as by the suggestions of native temperament, to infuse the new moral spirit of which he was the vehicle into the forms of speculative thought, which harmonized with the genius of the age and were sanctioned by high authority. Whatever may have been the determining influence in the apostle's mind, it appears to me the fairest inference from an unstrained interpretation of the language of his Gospel, and from a consideration of the historical relation in which it stands to the philosophical theories preceding, and the theological systems following, its publication, and whose wanting link of filiation it seems most naturally to supply,—that John did mean to teach the pre-existence of the Word (*hypostatised* according to the philosophical conceptions of the age) in the bosom of the Father, and the manifestation of it on earth, in the person of the man Christ Jesus.†

---

[*] See Norton, on the Logos, in his *Statement of Reasons*, p. 258; also Priestley's *History of Early Opinions*, vol. ii. p. 3.

[†] σφραγὶs. The expression ἐσφράγισεν occurs John iii. 33; vi. 27.

[‡] Compare above the description of the Zoroastrian *Honover*.

[§] Lücke, *Comm. Einleit.* p. 238. Norton, sect. X. Priestley's *Early Opinions*, Book I. ch. 8.

---

* Lücke, *ubi supra*, p. 240—3. Priestley, vol. ii. p. 17.

† It is with no little diffidence, that I avow a conclusion different from that which has been adopted by many sincere inquirers after truth, in whose general views of Christianity I rejoice to participate. The respected author of the "Essay on the Proem to John's Gospel," before alluded to, appears to me to have pointed out ably and suc-

To this extent, it is to me conceivable, that the outward form and purely intellectual apprehension of the spirit of Christianity, —that spirit, by which it has reconstituted human relations to God, and formed the moral world anew—may have been modified by the influence of contemporary modes of thought. "It is as unhistorical," says Dr. Lücke, "to deny the influence of the age upon the outward manifestation and didactic development of the Gospel, as to attempt to evolve out of the circumstances of the time the causes of its origin and living essence. Every truly great and original achievement of man, which creates an epoch in the history of the human race, issues from a hidden and primitive source, to which no mortal eye can pierce. This source the Christian finds in the eternal and all-pervading energy of God, and in Christ he believes the fullness of that divine spirit" (i. e. in reference to God's moral relations to mankind) "to have existed;—for to deny this, is to deny him

---

cessfully the *primitive* idea in the writings of the Old Testament, with which the conception of the Logos in John is *indirectly* and *remotely* allied, but—from bringing these two elements of interpretation into immediate combination, and omitting the historical development of the idea in the apocryphal writings, and more particularly in the philosophical theories of the School of Alexandria, which I conceive to have intervened between them—to have excluded considerations that are indispensable to adequately unfolding the sense of this obscure portion of the apostle's writings. Dr. Priestley says, (History of Early Opinions, vol. ii. p. 18,) "Where Philo ended the doctrine of personification, that of the Christian Fathers began. The difference was that, whereas Philo thought the emission of the Logos to be occasional, and to assume various forms, particularly that of angels, the Christian Fathers thought it to be uniform and permanent, and interpreted it of Christ only." To the same effect, Professor Norton observes, (Reasons, &c. p. 237,) "These representations (of Philo) were received by the early Fathers as the groundwork of their doctrine concerning the personal Logos." Now, when we consider the acknowledged coincidence of the phraseology of John's Gospel with that of the Alexandrine School, and that the Fathers specifically referred to John for the justification of their own doctrine of the Logos,—I cannot disguise from myself the inference,—that, *but* for the assumption, that the speculative views of John could not be modified by the philosophical theories of his age, and that between the representations of different parts of the New Testament no *dogmatic* discrepancy could exist,—that, in short, if the inquiry had been supposed to relate to the history of merely *human* opinion—the Gospel of John would at once have been regarded as the connecting link between these two lines of philosophical development,—the medium, in spirit and moral significance still essentially Christian, through which the speculative tendencies of the later Judaism were transfused into the new life of Christianity. A minute but curious illustration of the connection *through* John between the Fathers and Philo, is furnished by the extracts from these writers given by Professor Norton and the Rev. W. Johns. Having no means of immediate access either to Philo or Origen, I rely on the accuracy of these learned and respectable men. "The true God," says Philo, (De Somniis. quoted by Norton p. 235. Dr. Priestley, Earl. Op. ii. p. 14, gives the original Greek,) "is denoted by that name with the article; others have it without the article; and thus his most venerable Logos is called God without the article." Origen (Comment., tom. ii. p. 46, Huet, quoted by Mr. Johns, Essay, p. 113,) remarks, "John uses the article, when the denomination God means the unoriginated cause of the universe; but he omits it, when he mentions God the Word." This distinction is observed in the introductory verse of the Proem; and the double relation of John to Philo and Origen appears to me to throw light on the sense in which he intended to employ the word *θεος* without the article.

to have been the Christ. He, whose doctrine has furnished us with a criterion for discriminating truth from error in the speculations of Philo and in all the philosophical wisdom of that age, must surely have drawn his inspiration from a higher source than the ideas of the age itself." *

Assuming the interpretation, which I have suggested, of the opening verses of this Gospel to be correct, I think we most naturally explain, by a reference to it, those passages which speak of Christ's intimate union with the Father, of the glory which he had with God before the foundation of the world, of his existing before Abraham, of his being in heaven, and of his ascending up where he was before. In this Gospel, great importance is attached to simple faith in Christ, as the means of escaping destruction and attaining to eternal life. Conversion is compared to a transition from death to life.† Not all, it is taught, to whom the Gospel is proposed, will believe, but those only to whom it is granted of the Father.‡ Hence the necessity for being born again of the spirit. The object of Christ's ministry is the building up of a moral unity between believers and God. By faith the heart of man is brought into living communion with the Son, who has life within himself,§ and through him with God, who is the eternal fountain of life. In accordance with this view, believers are exhorted to cultivate a spirit of harmony and brotherly love, and to separate themselves from the evil that is in the world. In the fulfilment of the Messianic hopes, they are taught to look forward to the continual extension of the limits of this little community, and to expect a time, when, under the guidance of the Spirit, replacing Christ's personal presence on earth, truth shall prevail over error, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd.|| To the Word are ascribed the attributes of Life and Light and Truth; and the same idea being expressed under a different form, Christ calls himself the Way, the Truth, and the Life, and says, that he is the only guide to the Father. His prayer for his disciples is, that they may be one in him, as he is one with God.¶

The same great general features of the religion of Jesus are presented here as in the three first Gospels, but somewhat modified in their expression, and clothed in a language, which prevents us from immediately recognising them. The moral and practical characteristics of Christianity are thrown into the

---

* Comment. Johann. Einleit. p. 245.

† *μεταβέβηκεν ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου εἰς τὴν ζωήν.* (John v. 24.)

‡ *οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐλθεῖν πρός με, ἐὰν μὴ ᾖ δεδομένον αὐτῷ ἐκ τοῦ πατρός μου.* (John vi. 65.)

§ John v. 26.

|| John x. 16.

¶ John xiv. 6; xvii.

back ground, and the spiritual is brought prominently into view. The popular notion of the kingdom of heaven, as exhibited by the Synoptical Evangelists, is replaced in John by the more refined conception of eternal life, viewed as a mental state, entered upon immediately by faith, though not fully realised within the limits of the present earthly existence.[*] The bold judicial imagery, by which the solemnities of the last judgment are depicted in the three first Gospels, gives way in John to the deeper and more significant expressions of Christ's coming to judgment, of the prince of this world being judged, of Christ's having all judgment committed to him by the Father, and of the word, that he has spoken, judging the unbeliever at the last day. The distinction, which runs through the language of the earlier Gospels between the present and the coming or future age or world,[†] does not appear in John, but the crisis of transition from one to the other is implied in a form of expression, which is altogether peculiar to him, 'the last day.'[‡] The world,[§] a comprehensive term for all the passions, prejudices and interests of the Jewish state and hierarchy, is represented in perpetual conflict with the ministry of Jesus, and under the government of the ruler of this world.[||] Christ's death and resurrection are a triumph over this world,[¶]—a defeating of the evil one,—an establishment of the final ascendancy of the heavenly and spiritual over the gross and the carnal. On the side of the world, are unbelief, sin, darkness, death; on the side of Christ and God, are belief, love, peace, the holy Spirit, divine light, and life eternal. The conflict between these two powers is the *κρίσις*, through which the world must pass. Christ's ascension to the Father, with whom he goes to prepare a place for his disciples, is the first decisive step towards the securing of eternal life; the Spirit, in his absence, will perpetuate and extend the conquests, which he has made on earth; and when he comes again, to receive his faithful followers unto himself, the bliss of the believing and virtuous will be perfected, and Christ and God and all good men will be for ever one.

The style of John is a vivid expression of his mind. It is deficient in logical precision and coherence; but it is earnest, impressive and pathetic. It is distinguished by the reiterated assertion, after short intervals, and often in forms but slightly varied, of the same idea,—as if the author laboured under the fullness of some thought or sentiment, which was strongly present to his own mind, and which he desired to impress with equal cogency on that of others. In recording the instructions of Christ, his language seems occasionally to melt away into the vague and the mystical, and demands a mind spiritual like his own, to enter fully into it, and to apprehend with precision the idea it is intended to convey. But when he describes an event or an action, these clouds instantly disappear; and the whole transaction is at once revealed to us in all the light of the most delightful truthfulness and reality. His descriptions of the cure of the man blind from his birth, of the raising of Lazarus, and of the circumstances attending the resurrection, are unrivalled in the clearness and distinctness of the impression, which they leave on the mind. As we read, we find it difficult to resist the impression, that they are transcripts of the recollections of an eye-witness.[*]

---

[*] John xvii. 3.

[†] *αἰὼν οὗτος, ὁ νῦν αἰών, αἰὼν μέλλων, ἐρχόμενος, ἐκεῖνος.*

[‡] *ἡ ἐσχάτη ἡμέρα.*

[§] *ὁ κόσμος.*

[||] *ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου.*

[¶] *ἐγὼ νενίκηκα τὸν κόσμον.*

How far the conclusions, which seem to me to result from an unbiassed interpretation of the Gospel of John, may be thought to render obligatory the admission of the pre-existence of Jesus Christ among the essential doctrines of Christianity,—must depend on the dogmatic importance we attach to John's conception of the hypostasis of the logos, and on our power of separating,—with clearness and satisfaction to our own minds,—the essence of the Gospel,—that eternal life, which it promises to the sincere believer,—from the forms of thought, through which it was outwardly manifested, and which must be reckoned among the transitory adjuncts of the age and country of its birth.[†] I do not deny the difficulty of making such a separation; and, while I see in all this a fit subject for patient, candid and serious inquiry, I can find nothing to justify impatient dogmatism and controversial virulence. If some difference of speculative opinion respecting the person of Jesus Christ existed even among the authors of the books of the New Testament—and the existence of such difference a careful analysis of those books will, I believe, render probable—surely a similar diversity of sentiment ought not to surprize us among Christians of the present day, and should furnish no occasion for mutual alienation and dislike. Our conclusion should rather be this; that he is the best Christian, whose whole heart and life are most deeply imbued with the spirit of his divine Exemplar, and who following him, simply and honestly, as the way, the truth, and the life, concedes that liberty of opinion to others which he claims for himself, and is willing to leave the final settlement of purely speculative questions to that world, where the spirit of love will silence for ever the contentions of theologians and the unholy warfare of sectarian tongues. I cannot more appropriately conclude this inquiry than in the words of the celebrated Lælius Socinus; "I desire to grow every day in the knowledge and belief of the truth, that I may give surer evidence of my love to God, and, quitting all the verbal disputes and contested opinions, all the thorny and inextricable labyrinths, of theologians,—may quietly acquiesce in the simplest truth of the word of God."*

---

[*] De Wette (*Einleit. ins N. T.* §. 105. d.) has collected the principal words and phrases which distinguish the style of John from that of the three first Evangelists. Among these may be reckoned his favourite use of the conjunction *ἵνα* for the infinitive of the common Greek (compare particularly iv. 34. vi. 50); upon which resolution of the conciser form, as indicative of a crisis in the history of the language, see some very instructive remarks by Winer, *Grammatik des Neutestamentl. Sprachidioms.* iii. *Syntax c.* 4. *pp.* 312. 13.

[†] It does not appear to have been sufficiently considered, that in the age of Christ the doctrine of the pre-existence of human souls was very generally diffused not merely as a philosophical speculation, but as an article of popular belief. Traces of it occur in the New Testament. Our Lord's own language alludes to it (Matt. xviii. 10): and the inquiry of the disciples respecting the man blind from his birth (John ix. 1, 2.) is intelligible on no other supposition. I have already alluded to the influence of the Zoroastrian system on the speculative theology of the Jews subsequent to the captivity. Of that system the doctrine of *Ferrers* or pre-existent souls forms a very conspicuous feature. The conception of these *Ferrers* sometimes corresponded to that of tutelary genii, (representations of which, hovering over the head of the monarch, may still, it is said, be traced among the bas-reliefs of the ruins of Persepolis); but Rhode (*Heilige Sage des Zendvolks*) has shown, that the *Ferver* and the soul were originally identical, and that death was considered as the release of the *Ferver* from the body. Connecting this belief with the notion which Philo is said to have entertained of the logos (Norton, Reasons, &c. p. 254. note), as the archetypal man, that

J. J. T.

---

image of God, after which man was created, and reducing these views, as we suppose them to have existed in the mind of John, from their philosophical form to their moral significance, we are brought to a doctrinal conclusion, closely allied to that which is embraced by many of the most enlightened Christians of the present day, among others by Dr. Channing—that of regarding Christ, without any determination of the question of his pre-existence, as the Ideal of humanity, the most perfect expression of the image of God in man.

* "Ego vera esse in dies magis ostendi cupio et mihi firmius persuaderi, ut amore possim deo meo vehementius adhærere, et lites verborum, concertationes opinionum, spinosas quæstiones, labyrinthos inextricabiles deserendo acquiescere in ipsa dei veritate simplicissima."—Quoted by Dr. Lücke in the *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* for 1840, p. 112.

ART. II.—MEMOIRS OF THE LIFE OF SIR SAMUEL ROMILLY. Edited by his Sons. 3 vols. 8vo.

THE Contributions to the autobiographical branch of our Literature have, of late, been unusually numerous and valuable. Within the last few years the public has been favoured with the Diaries of four remarkable and distinguished men; all eminent in their respective lines, but diverging widely in character and pursuits, and in the influence which they exercised upon contemporary persons and events;—Scott, Mackintosh, Wilberforce, and Romilly.

The volumes now before us record, too scantily, the thoughts and actions of a wise and good man, who flourished during a singularly interesting and momentous period of human history; who lived in habits of intimate and friendly intercourse with the most celebrated and conspicuous characters of the age; and who himself bore no inconsiderable share in the great political drama which was enacted around him.—The narrative and correspondence extend over a period of more than forty years; including the American war, the French Revolution, and the rise and fall of the fortunes of Napoleon;—and the chosen friends and associates of the writer were Dumont, Mirabeau, Fox, Erskine, Grey, Bentham, and Brougham.

The work is edited by the sons of Sir Samuel Romilly with a taste, judgment, and discretion, which form a remarkable contrast with one of the publications we have just named. It consists entirely of letters to and from his friends, of a narrative of his early life, and a diary of his political career. The editors, we regret to say, have added nothing of their own, beyond a few explanatory notes.

"There are many deficiences in these memoirs which, consistently with the plan adopted, the Editors are unable to supply. Of one part, and that a most material one, of their father's life, they regret to say that no account is to be found in these pages. Of his labours in the study of the law, of his gradual rise and ultimate success in his profession, to which he owed the opportunities of doing all that is here recorded, these pages contain scarcely any mention. Although abundant materials remain which testify the intensity of his labours in his profession, he has left none which show the mode by which he rose, nor the eminence which he reached. The editors have not sought for information to supply this omission, being anxious that his character should appear as it is displayed by himself. If, in truth, they had departed from this course, it would have been, not to record his triumphs in his profession, or to relate the influence of his eloquence, but to describe some few of those scenes which live in the memories of them all, when in the intervals of relaxation from his labours and in the midst of his children, he sympathised in their pursuits, partook of their enjoyments, added by his gaiety to their mirth, and to each, in his different way, was scarcely less a companion than a father. This gratification, however, they have not ventured to allow themselves; and as they neither pretend to write his life, nor affect to possess the impartiality which should belong to those who undertake that task, they have deemed it necessary, with whatever reluctance, to confine themselves strictly to the course they had laid down for their conduct, and to which alone they feel themselves to be equal."—Preface, p. vi.

Romilly's family was of foreign extraction. His grandfather had quited France to escape the persecution to which all Protestants were exposed after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. His father was a tradesman, in easy, but not affluent circumstances, who bequeathed to his children little but that independence of spirit and integrity of character which cast both wealth and pedigree into the shade. Samuel was the youngest of nine children, of whom the six eldest died in infancy. In childhood, as throughout life, he was distinguished by the warmest and tenderest affections, and by an anxious and nervous sensibility which, though always controlled by his strong sense and energetic character, was never wholly eradicated.*

"The servant whom I have mentioned was to me in the place of a mother. I loved her to adoration. I remember, when quite a child, kissing, unperceived by her, the clothes she wore; and when once she entertained a design of quitting our family and going to live with her own relations, receiving the news as that of the greatest misfortune that could befal me; and going up into my room in an agony of affliction, and imploring God upon my knees to avert so terrible a calamity.—— It is commonly said to be the happy privilege of childhood to feel no misfortunes but the present, to be careless of the future, and forgetful of the past. That happy privilege I cannot recollect having ever enjoyed. In my earliest infancy, my imagination was alarmed and my fears awakened by stories of devils, witches, and apparitions; and they had a much greater effect upon me than is even usual with children; at least I judge so, from this effect being of a more than usual duration. The images of terror, with which those tales abound, infested my imagination long after I had discarded all belief in the tales themselves, and in the notions on which they are built; and even now, although I have been accustomed for many years to pass my evenings and my nights in solitude, I must, with some shame, confess that they are sometimes very unwelcome intruders on my thoughts. I had other apprehensions, and some of a kind which are commonly reserved for maturer years. I was oppressed with a constant terror of death, not indeed for myself, but for my father, whose life was certainly far dearer to me than my own. I never looked upon his countenance, on which care and affliction had deeply imprinted premature marks of old age, without reflecting that there could not be many years of his excellent life still to come. If he returned home later than usual, though but an hour, a thousand accidents presented themselves to my mind; and when put to bed, I lay sleepless and in the most tormenting anxiety till I heard him knock. This state of mind became so habitual to me, that an uneasiness and a foreboding of some misfortune came upon me regularly about half an hour before the usual time of his return, and went on increasing till the moment of his arrival."—i. 10, 12.

---

* "A dinner of abolitionists at Stephens'. Wilberforce, Romilly, Brougham, &c. Several horrible accounts of cruelty of masters to their slaves.—I never observed any man so deeply and violently affected by the recital of cruelty as Romilly; he curbed his emotion with a like violence, but during the afternoon was irritable and gloomy."—Sir James Mackintosh's Journal, 345.

The education which Romilly received at school seems to have been wretchedly imperfect,—a disadvantage which he afterwards laboured indefatigably to redeem, when about his sixteenth year he first awakened to a sense of the value of learning, and of the deficiency of his own acquirements. By unremitting diligence he contrived, while performing the duties of an articled clerk to a respectable attorney, to obtain a thorough acquaintance with both the Latin and English Classics, and also to indulge himself in occasional excursions into the regions of lighter literature.

About this period he was fortunate enough to meet with—what is perhaps the most valuable of all blessings to a young man of ardent mind and sensitive imagination, just opening on the vast field of knowledge,—a friend who could direct him in his studies, guide his inexperienced judgment, and correct his unformed taste. This was the Reverend John Roget, a Genevese clergyman, who came to reside, as officiating minister at the French chapel, in London; who afterwards married Romilly's sister, and to whom a great proportion of the letters contained in the first volume are addressed. Romilly observes:—

"He took great pleasure in talking with me about my studies; used to give me great encouragement to persevere in them; and often pronounced of the talents which he supposed me to possess, predictions which have never been fulfilled, but which, as is often the case with prophecies of another kind, had a strong tendency to bring about their own accomplishment.—Roget was an admirer of the writings of his countryman Rousseau, and he made me acquainted with them. With what astonishment and delight did I first read them! I seemed transported into a new world. His seducing eloquence so captivated me, that I was blind to all his errors. I imbibed all his doctrines, adopted all his opinions, and embraced his system of morality with the fervour of a convert to some new religion. That enthusiasm has long since evaporated, though I am not even now so cold and insensible, as to be able under any circumstances to read his writings with an even and languid pulse, and with unmoistened eyes . . . . But though the writings of Rousseau contain many errors on the most important subjects, they may yet be read with great advantage. There is, perhaps, no writer so capable of inspiring a young mind with an ardent love of virtue, a fixed hatred of oppression, and a contempt of all false glory, as Rousseau; and I ascribe, in a great degree, to the irrational admiration of him which I once entertained, those dispositions of mind, from which I have derived my greatest happiness throughout life."—i. 32.

It was to the advice of this excellent and judicious friend, who roused his dormant ambition, and encouraged his diffident and timid spirit, that he owed that choice of a profession which was the groundwork of his future eminence. He was twenty-one years of age when he entered himself at Gray's Inn; and after considerable interruptions arising from the ill health of his brother-in-law, and his own, (which had been injured by excessive application,) he was called to the bar in 1783, and chose the Midland circuit. He seems to have been seven or eight years without any employment in his profession;—but of his subsequent rapid progress, and of the steps by which he reached that undisputed pre-eminence which he afterwards enjoyed, unfortunately no traces remain.

A considerable part of the first volume of these Memoirs consists of letters addressed by Sir Samuel Romilly to Mr. Roget, who was then residing at Lausanne. These letters give a very interesting sketch of the disgraceful and calamitous riots of 1780,—of the events of the American war, and of the principal proceedings of the House of Commons, under the gallery of which Romilly was a constant attendant. Into this portion of the Memoirs our limits prevent us from entering.

In the great events of the French Revolution few men took a more vivid interest than Romilly. He visited Paris several times, both before and after the Revolution; and was intimately acquainted with several of the most conspicuous persons of that remarkable period, whose characters he frequently sketches with great force and correctness. Among these were Diderot, D'Alembert, Malesherbes, Talleyrand, Brissot, and La Fayette. The talents of D'Alembert, and the character of Diderot, appear to have inspired him with little respect.

"The literati of Paris are all agreed to say, '*depuis ce temps,*' instead of '*depuis lors*.'. . . This piece of knowledge is not to be despised, for it is almost all I learned in two visits to the reserved D'Alembert. Whatever subject I talked of, he found means to turn the discourse upon what was to be seen in Paris; as if I visited him for the sake of gaining imperfectly that intelligence which was to be had completely in the Curiosités de Paris."—i. 201.

"The manner in which these two authors used to speak of one another, well exemplifies their different dispositions. Rousseau, though fully persuaded that Diderot had used him exceedingly ill, used to tell Mr. Romilly that he did well to continue his acquaintance with him, for that there was much to be learned in his conversation. Diderot, on the contrary, could not forgive Mr. Romilly* for seeing Rousseau, whom he loaded with most opprobrious names, though he would never particularize the injuries he pretended to have received from him. The acrimony of Diderot against Rousseau, instead of abating, seems to have increased with the death of that unfortunate man. His remains were hardly cold before Diderot, in his *Life of Seneca,* treated him in vague and general terms, as a monster of hypocrisy and impurity" . . . . "You ask me what I think of Diderot?—With respect to the atheists of Paris, among honest men there can hardly be two opinions. A man must be grossly stupid who can entertain such pernicious notions on subjects of the highest importance without strictly examining them; and much is he to be pitied if, after examination, he still retains them;—but if, without examination of them, and uncertain of their truth, though certain of their fatal consequences, he industriously propagates them among mankind, one loses all compassion for him in abhorrence of his guilt. He is like a man infected with some deadly contagious disease, for whom one's heart bleeds while he submits in secrecy to his fate; but when one sees him running into the midst of a multitude, with the infernal design of communicating the pestilence to his fellow-creatures, indignation and horror take the place of pity."—i. pp. 174. 198.

With Mirabeau, Romilly was intimately acquainted, both before and during the period of his greatest celebrity; and he speaks of him in several passages of his memoirs at considerable length.† He regarded him as a man, who, though inordinately vain and deplorably unscrupulous, was guided in his public conduct by motives of genuine and lofty patriotism.

"He was a great plagiarist; but it was from avarice, not poverty, that he appropriated to himself the views and the eloquence of others. Whatever he found forcible or beautiful, he considered as a kind of common property of which he might avail himself, and of which he ought to make the most to promote the objects he had in view; and notwithstanding all that has been said against him, I am well convinced that both in his writings and his speeches, he had what he sincerely conceived to be the good of mankind for his object. He was vain, and he was inordinately ambitious; but his ambition was to act a noble part, and to establish the liberty of his country on the most solid foundations."—i. p. 109.

---

* The Mr. Romilly here mentioned was no relation of Sir S. Romilly.—See *vol.* i. *p.* 64.

† In one of Mirabeau's letters to Sir Samuel Romilly, is the following passage, which is worth quoting, both for its singularity and for the germ of truth which it contains.—"Mon ami, j'en viens à croire que l'on ne fait point triompher la vérité en s'immolant pour elle. La persécution, qui étend les progrès de l'erreur, arrête ceux de la raison; et les philosophes ne se multiplient point, comme les fanatiques, dans l'exil, dans les prisons, et sous la hache des bourreaux."—i. 296.

When the period arrived which brought this extraordinary and irregular genius prominently forward on the public stage;—when the States-General met for the purpose of endeavouring to raise a great nation out of the deplorable abyss into which it had been plunged by an oppressive aristocracy and a spendthrift court,—Romilly, in common with every friend to the emancipation and improvement of mankind, (with one brilliant and illustrious exception,) hailed that great event with the enthusiasm of a young and fervent imagination. He saw in it the advent of better days,—the promise of a worthier career for depressed humanity,—the commencement of a new era of triumphant virtue,—of respected rights,—of developed capabilities,—of illimitable progression.* In proportion to the brightness of the hopes in which he had indulged, was his profound sorrow and indignation when that glorious dawn was overcast;—when all the vices generated by oppression,—the abject vices which it generates in those who submit to it—the ferocious vices which it generates in those who struggle against it;—when vanity and selfishness—besotted ignorance and thirsty cruelty, concurred to sully the holiest cause, and frustrate the easiest victory that freedom and justice had ever won. Romilly, however, retained his faith and hope in Gallic virtue longer than most; and it was not till the massacres of September that his anticipations of a happy result to the Revolution were wholly extinguished. On this occasion he writes to his friend Dumont:—

"How could we ever be so deceived in the character of the French nation as to think them capable of liberty! Wretches who, after all their professions and boast about liberty, and patriotism, and courage, and dying, and after taking oath after oath, at the very moment when their country is invaded, and an enemy is marching through it unresisted, employ whole days in murdering priests, and women, and prisoners;—and then (who are worse even than these) the cold instigators of these murders, who, while blood is streaming around them on every side, permit this carnage to go on, and reason about it, and defend it, nay even applaud it, and talk about the example they are setting to all nations!"—ii. p. 4.

---

* "Those only who had irrevocably attached their early hopes, their little reputation, and even, as they conceived, their moral character, to the success or failure of the French Revolution, can conceive the succession of feelings, most of them very painful, which agitated my mind during its progress. The witnesses of my emotion on the murder of General Dillon,—on the 10th of August,—on the massacre in the prisons—on the death of the king, are no more. But the memory of what it is no hyperbole to call my sufferings, is at this instant fresh."—*Memoirs of Sir James Mackintosh*, i. 131.

Dumont replies in similar language:—

"Je me promène la moitié du jour dans une agitation extrême, et par l' impossibilité de rester en place, en pensant à tous les événemens malheureux qui découlent d' une source d' où nous nous sommes flattés de voir sortir le bonheur du genre humain. . . . Qui croiroit qu' avec de si belles maximes on pût se livrer à de tels excés, et que la constitution la plus extravagante en fait de liberté, parôitroit à ces sauvages le code de la tyrannie! Le passé est affreux, mais ce qu' il y a de plus affreux encore, c'est qu' on ne peut rien attendre, rien espérer pour l' avenir."—ii. p. 6.

For many years little more is recorded of Romilly, except that he continued to rise in his profession, and at length obtained the decided lead at the Chancery-Bar; and found himself possessed of a more lucrative practice than any barrister, we believe, either before or since. Hitherto he had taken a vivid interest, but no active share, in political events; but in 1806, on the formation of the Ministry known by the *soubriquet* of "All the Talents," with Fox and Lord Grenville at its head, he was appointed to the office of Solicitor-General, and took his seat in Parliament for the Borough of Queensborough. He remained in office little more than a year, but he continued to sit in Parliament till the close of his life, and discharged the duties of a Senator with unwearied diligence and zeal. Sincerely devoted to his country's good and the service of his fellow men, he was ever ready to defend the right—to sympathise with the oppressed, and to expose the oppressor;—but aware, at the same time, that in public life efforts must be concentrated in order to be successful,—he turned his peculiar attention to one most important and neglected branch of legislation,—the reform of our penal code. The statute book was at that period disgraced by a number of laws enacting the most sanguinary penalties for very trivial offences. Privately stealing from the person; stealing from a shop to the value of five shillings; stealing from bleach grounds; stealing from a boat or a dwelling house to the value of forty shillings,—were all capital offences. Session after session, with unwearied perseverance, Sir Samuel Romilly brought in a series of bills to repeal these disproportionate and savage penalties;

and though his humane exertions were repeatedly defeated, he pertinaciously returned to the contest;—and in two instances his labours were crowned with success.

He also brought into Parliament a Bill to amend the Bankrupt Laws, and another to render freehold, and even entailed, estates, liable for the debts of their possessors. This measure, although one of simple justice, would have had too severe and extensive an operation on the indebted and encumbered aristocracy of this country, to be endured for an hour by either of the two great parties who divide between them the loaves and fishes of the state; and it was accordingly rejected. A Bill, however, to render freehold property answerable for simple contract debts was a few years ago successfully carried through Parliament by Mr. John Romilly.

It would carry us far beyond our limits to mention the part taken by Sir Samuel Romilly on the various questions which were agitated in Parliament during that most disastrous and discreditable period of English History. He invariably stood up in the foremost ranks to defend the cause of civil liberty, of public justice, of national morality;—and by his undeviating rectitude and lofty principle, earned a reputation among all classes of his countrymen, unequalled by any other public character of the time. The requisition which was presented to him in 1818 to become a candidate for the representation of Westminster is a striking testimony to the high estimation in which he was held by all who had watched his professional and parliamentary career.

"To Sir Samuel Romilly.

"Sir,—Anxious to see this popular and important city represented in Parliament by a person conspicuous in the country for talents and integrity, we, the undersigned inhabitants of Westminster, request you to permit us to put you in nomination at the ensuing election. We further request you to abstain from all personal attendance, trouble, or expense. We require from you no pledge, since the uniform tenour of your honorable life, your known attachment to the constitution, your zealous and unremitting efforts for the amelioration of the laws, the correction of abuses, and the support of the cause of justice, freedom, and humanity, wherever assailed, are a sure pledge to us of your qualifications for our service, in common with that of the country at large.

"We have the honour, &c." iii. 357.

This honourable invitation Sir Samuel Romilly accepted; and

---

* A few days after the rejection of this Bill, Sir Samuel Romilly brought in another for the same object, but confining its operation to persons engaged in trade and commerce. This measure passed without any opposition. "Country gentlemen (observes Romilly) have no objection to tradesmen being made to pay their debts; and to the honour of men in trade, of whom there are a good many in the House, they too had no objection to it."—ii. 198.

after a severe contest, with the whole influence of the Government and of the democratic party arrayed against him, he was returned at the head of the poll, without having once appeared upon the hustings, and without having solicited a single vote. This was the last scene of his public life. The sunset was worthy of the bright and cloudless day.

The Memoirs of Sir Samuel Romilly are peculiarly rich in bright examples, and replete with lessons of pure and lofty morality.

> "There is no other work," says Dumont, "of this kind which could produce the same moral effects upon a youthful mind. On the one side we see great talents, great reputation, and an ample fortune;—and on the other an obscure origin, scarcely any education, years lost—all these disadvantages overcome by unwearied application, and by efforts constantly directed towards the same end. It is a lesson composed entirely of facts, worth more than volumes of moral sentiments; to which none of those pretences by which young people commonly reconcile themselves to their own nothingness, can be suggested as an answer. It seems to me that it cannot fail to produce a lasting effect upon those who know how to profit by a great example, and to reflect upon what may be done with life by him who chooses to employ it."—Preface, p. x. xiii.

The first reflection that suggests itself in the perusal of this work, is the happy illustration it affords of the influence of character in public life. The abilities of Sir Samuel Romilly, though solid and superior, were scarcely to be considered brilliant or commanding. His speeches and writings are marked rather by strong sense, mature reflection, and that clearness of vision which rectitude of purpose almost always gives, than by any of those more splendid and dazzling qualities which we are apt to estimate far above their real value. Indeed we are disposed to doubt whether that peculiar quality, or combination of qualities which we call brilliancy, so far from being entitled to admiration as an excellence of especial merit, be not rather a defect, or the consequence of a defect, in the character of the intellect. Brilliancy is, in fact, the result of the undue predominance of one quality,—the excess of one of the many elements which combine in the formation of mental or moral character. In a mind of which all the parts are balanced and adjusted into perfect harmony;—where the highest intellectual powers are modified and chastened by other qualities which nature gave to be their correctives and antagonists;—where vivid imagination is under the guidance of the severest taste;—where the keenest sensibility is preserved from morbid excess by lofty purpose and an energetic will;—where ardent aspirings are controlled by habits of practical and sober thought;—where eloquence of description is checked by a scrupulous and perpetual reverence for truth; and eloquence of invective is softened and restrained by a tender regard to the feelings even of the hostile and the guilty;—in such a character—although the perfection of human excellence—there will be no brilliancy, because there will be no faculties unduly or excessively developed.

It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that the greater part of this description applies to Sir Samuel Romilly, than whom there never existed a man in whom the conflicting elements of character were more nicely, or more happily adjusted;—and perhaps our admiration is more peculiarly aroused in his case, by that union of the gentler affections with the sterner virtues, which, of all combinations of moral excellence, is at once the loveliest, and the rarest. Austere moralists are too generally harsh and unbending in the common intercourse of life,—as if to show how forbidding an aspect virtue can put on;—but in Sir Samuel Romilly nothing of this might be discerned; and that severe and rigid uprightness which marked every action of his life, and which, in a man of inferior talents, less tender affections, and less genuine humility, would have degenerated into a stiff and stiltish, or perhaps into a morbid and vacillating scrupulosity,—was reserved rather for his own guidance, than for the rebuke of others. And in this conventional and shallow world, where the essential is so often forgotten in the adventitious,—where virtue is so often seen in the unsuitable companionship of weakness, which degrades it—of follies which disguise it—of errors, which disfigure it—of ignorance, which misleads it,—a deep debt of gratitude is due to those who present it to mankind under an aspect which commands love and admiration, as well as reluctant and unfruitful esteem; and who show an unbelieving world how venerable and how lovely virtue may become when united with all that is noble in human intellect, and all that is gentle in human affections.

It was this rare combination of talent to command attention, with integrity to conquer admiration even from the unfriendly and the careless, that gave to Sir Samuel Romilly that influence in public life, to which men of all parties bore such honourable testimony. A remark which Dumont makes as to the weak point of Mirabeau's position, forcibly illustrates the strong point of Romilly's. "Combien de fois il m' a fait déplorer qu' il manquât à ses moyens la puissance que donne une réputation intacte!" The character* of Romilly was unbreathed upon by the voice of calumny. He passed through his public career, as he entered it, invulnerable to the assaults of slander;—and though many statesmen have enjoyed a wider and more brilliant reputation, few, in any age, have left behind them so spotless or so fair a fame.

---

* How often have I lamented that his powers should have wanted the influence of an unsullied reputation!—*Vol.* i. *p.* 423.

Another characteristic of Romilly was the pure and lofty nature of his ambition; and this, not merely at the outset, but up to the very close of his career, and when the highest official situation in the realm was open to his hopes. Indeed his sentiments on this subject rather resemble the high toned enthusiasm of ingenuous and inexperienced youth, than the moderate and coarse-spun principle of the veteran politician. "More skilled to raise the wretched, than to rise," he desired fame, popularity, high influence, and lofty station, not as rewards to be aimed at, or blessings to be cherished, but as instruments for the promotion of those plans of social improvement and enlarged benevolence, which formed the labour of his life. We should not greatly envy the feelings of that man who could read the following peroration of a speech on the abolition of the Slave Trade, without sharing those emotions with which it was listened to in Parliament.

> "Many honourable Members of this House may yet live to witness the benefits which will flow from the abolition of this abominable traffic; and to them is reserved perhaps the greatest happiness which, in this state of existence, we are permitted to enjoy. What a delightful reflection is it, to think that generations yet unborn will bless our memories as the authors of their liberty and happiness! But Sir, if such will be the feelings of those who have borne any part in this transaction, or have even witnessed its completion, what must be the feelings of my honourable friend (Mr. Wilberforce)? What is there in the wide range of human ambition, which could afford pleasure so pure, gratification so exalted, as he must enjoy? When I look at the man at the head of the French Monarchy, surrounded as he is with all the pomp of power, and all the pride of victory, distributing kingdoms to his family and principalities to his followers; seeming, as he sits upon his throne, to have reached the summit of human ambition, and the pinnacle of earthly happiness;—and when I follow him into his closet, or to his bed, and contemplate the anguish with which his solitude must be tortured by the recollections of the oppressions he has committed, and the blood which he has spilt;—and when I compare with these pangs of remorse the feelings which must accompany my honourable friend from this house to his home, after the vote of this night shall have accomplished the object of his unceasing labours;—when he shall retire into the bosom of his delighted and happy family;—when he shall lay himself down upon his bed, reflecting on the innumerable voices that will be raised in every quarter of the world to bless his name;—how much more enviable is his

lot, in the consciousness of having preserved so many millions of his fellow creatures, than that of the man with whom I have compared him; on a throne to which he has waded through slaughter and oppression."—Speeches, i. p. 30.

These sentiments were not with Sir Samuel Romilly, as they too often have been with others, the mere transient emotions of the hour, or brought forward for oratorical effect. They were the sober and intimate convictions of his heart; as every page of his Memoirs serves to show. We have only space for two extracts.

"Thinned as the ranks of the Opposition have lately been, it becomes each of us who remain to do all we can to resist the pernicious measures of Government. The exertions I have made, to my own very great personal inconvenience, and to the great interruption of my professional engagements, and consequently with no small pecuniary sacrifices, will, I make no doubt, be ascribed by many persons to an eager desire to turn out the present administration, and to obtain for myself the office of Lord Chancellor, to which it may naturally enough be supposed that I should, in such an event, aspire. How little do those who ascribe my conduct to such motives know me! With the utmost sincerity I can declare that I have no such ambition. I am deeply impressed with the conviction that high station would add nothing to my happiness, or even to my reputation. Already I have attained the very summit of my wishes. The happiness of my present condition cannot be increased: it may be essentially impaired. I am at this moment completely independent both of the favours and the frowns of Government. The large income which I enjoy, and which is equal to all my wishes, has been entirely produced by my own industry and exertions; for no portion of it am I indebted to the Crown: of no particle of it is it in the power of the Crown to deprive me. The labours of my profession, great as they are, yet leave me some leisure, both for domestic, and even for literary enjoyments? In those enjoyments, in the retirement of my study, in the bosom of my family, in the affection of my friends, in the good-will of my fellow-citizens, in the uncourted popularity which I know that I enjoy, I find all the good that human life can supply; and I am not, whatever others may think of me, so blinded by a preposterous ambition, as to wish to change, or even to risk,

'These sacred and homefelt delights,
This sober certainty of waking bliss,'

for the pomp and parade, and splendid restraints of office; for the homage and applause of devoted but interested adherents; for that admiration which the splendour of a high station, by whomsoever possessed, is always certain to command; and for a much larger, but a precarious, income, which must bring with it the necessity of a much larger expense. The highest office, and the greatest dignity the Crown has to bestow, might make me miserable: it is impossible that it could render me happier than I already am."— iii. 310.

In a letter dated 1818, we find the following passage :—

> "God forbid that my public conduct should ever recommend me to the favour of any of these princes. Still, however, though never destined to fill any public office, and though few must be the years that remain to me, I am not without the means of rendering some services to mankind; and I still feel a strong impulse to employ these means to the best advantage. The faculties, indeed, which I possess, and the influence I have in Parliament, are not sufficient to enable me to carry there any important measures; yet it remains for me to propose what I think right; to resist what is pernicious; *to support my opinions by sound arguments, and on generous principles*; and to leave to the world an example in public life, of honesty, independence, and patriotism. In following this course I shall not have lived in vain; and little as those who breathe the same air with myself may profit by my exertions, it is possible that the happiness which those who are to come after me, nay, which a remote posterity may enjoy, may in some degree be attributable even to my unsuccessful efforts, and rejected motions."—iii. p. 411.

To the singularly noble and unselfish character of his ambition may be chiefly traced the fortitude and equanimity with which Sir Samuel Romilly bore the repeated disappointments and defeats which he was doomed to encounter in the success of his benevolent schemes. Year after year his proposals for the reformation of our penal code were rejected without reason, and almost without a hearing;—yet no expression of vexation, murmur, or despondency ever escapes from him; and he was ready to renew his exertions on the first suitable occasion. Perhaps this is one of the most striking characteristics which distinguish a vulgar and personal, from a generous and elevated ambition. The man whose objects in public life are merely rank, power, or the emoluments of office, is painfully sensitive to failure;—he feels every defeat, or even postponement of success, as a personal infliction;—and repeated disappointments drive him to absolute despair. But the statesman, whose object in the painful and thankless toils of the political arena,—whose motive "to scorn delight and live laborious days,"—is the happiness of others, and not his own,—feels amid all his failures a firm conviction in the justice of his cause, and the future triumph of his hopes; and the sense of inbred satisfaction which he cannot but experience at having deserved the success which he has not attained, is at once his encouragement to struggle—his reward in victory—his consolation in defeat.

The two great enemies to perfect integrity in public life are, attachment to office, and attachment to party. It is a hard thing for a man who aspires to high official distinction, to refrain from sometimes warping or concealing his opinions, or modifying his conduct, to please those by whom such distinction is conferred. It is perhaps harder still for a man of kindly feelings to oppose in public, those who are his friends in private life, and to take measures which are known to be distasteful to the party with which he is accustomed habitually to act. Through both these ordeals Romilly came forth untouched. Yet he was a man of sensitive feelings; and his hopes were directed to the Chancellorship, which a slight deviation from uprightness would probably have placed within his reach. In the year 1805, before the commencement of his public life, and when he was merely a leading advocate at the Chancery Bar, the Prince of Wales (whose own profligacy did not prevent his fairly appreciating the virtues and abilities of others) was desirous of forming an intimate connection with one on whose wisdom and integrity he could so fully rely; and proposed in the most flattering manner to bring Romilly into Parliament. This offer he might have accepted without any departure from principle, for his political opinions were those of the party with whom the Prince generally acted; and he could not but see that the friendship to which he was thus invited would have given him an influence over the mind of the Heir Apparent, which would, in all probability, have led him to the highest official eminence. On mature consideration, however, he declined the proposal, for the following reasons:—

> "I was averse to being brought into Parliament by any man, but by the Prince almost above all others. To be under personal obligations of that kind to him; to be in a situation in which, as a lawyer and a politician, he might repose a particular confidence in me, was what I above all things dreaded. I knew, from some conversations which Lord Lansdowne told me had taken place between him and Lord Moira some years before, that the Prince had expressed a wish to know some lawyer upon whose advice he could safely rely, and in whom he might place unbounded confidence; and that he was desirous of forming such a connection before his accession to the throne. The subject of this desired confidence was also mentioned to me; and it was one upon which I imagined the best advice was likely to be the least acceptable. These circumstances occurred to me when I wrote my answer; and I thought it might perhaps prove fortunate that I had thus early an opportunity of letting the Prince know what I was. If, such as he found me, he should be disposed to advance me to any high honour, I might indeed hope to be able to render some important services to the public;—if, on the other hand, this specimen of my independence should prove an obstacle to my promotion, it would be clear that I could not obtain it but upon conditions understood, if not expressed, to which I never would submit."—ii. 120.

Later in life a similar temptation from the same quarter was again presented to him. This was in 1813, when the hopeless illness of the King had placed the Prince Regent on the throne; and when his decided adoption of the Tory party had closed all the avenues of office to Sir Samuel Romilly and his friends. It will be seen how promptly and how firmly he withstood the most flattering and insidious proposals.

"Mr. Nash, the architect, who has been in great favour with the Regent, and who lives in constant habits of intimacy with Lord Yarmouth, called on me this morning. He told me that the manly part I had taken in the debate on Friday had been very thankfully received at Carlton House; and though he did not come with any express message to me, yet he knew with certainty that the Regent was very desirous of seeing and consulting me; and he desired me to tell him whether I should have any objection to see the Prince on the subject of the Princess of Wales. I told him that I was very sorry, but that I certainly must object to it. That the treatment of the Princess was a matter of great public concern; and that it appeared to me very unconstitutional for the Sovereign to advise with any persons but his Ministers, on any public concern."—iii. 86.

"Mr. Nash called on me again. He told me that the Prince was still desirous of seeing me; and said that he had a right to consult me as his Counsel, and that as such I was retained for him. I told Mr. Nash that in all his Royal Highness's private concerns, he had undoubtedly a right to command my advice and assistance; but that the conduct of the Princess had become a matter of state,—and that it was impossible for me to advise with the Prince upon it."——

"We had some more conversation, in which he said that Lord Yarmouth had asked him whether he thought I was so much of a party man as on that account to have any personal objection to himself:—and he asked, but entirely from himself, whether I should think it a duty to refuse the Great Seal, if it were offered me, unless all my political friends formed a part of the administration. I told him that it was not by party motives that I was actuated; but that my opinion was, that no good could be done to the country unless those men who had acted upon Mr. Fox's principles were in administration; and that I should not consent to form part of any administration in which they were not comprehended."—iii. 88, 90.

"Mr. Nash called on me again this morning. He said he came to renew the subject of our last conversation. That he was extremely anxious I should see the Prince; that the Prince had no person who would speak honestly and openly to him; that he thought that, if I saw him, what I should say to him might lead to a total change of the administration; that he was still attached to his former political friends;—&c. To all this I answered, that the more I considered the subject, the more I felt the great impropriety of the Prince taking advice relative to the Princess from any person but his responsible Ministers; and that I could not reconcile it to my notions of duty to offer him any advice."——

"I dined today at Nash's.—Nash took me aside to tell me that everything was in confusion at Carlton House; that this was the moment for bringing about a change of administration; that he was himself most anxious it should be effected; and that I was the link by which the Prince might be re-united to his old political friends. I told him this really appeared to me to be quite impossible."—iii. 91, 93.

In 1809, the House of Commons was occupied a considerable time in investigating a charge brought against the Duke of York, then Commander-in-Chief, for corrupt practices in the disposal of army promotions. In the debate on this subject Sir Samuel Romilly took a decided part against the Duke, contrary to the advice of all his friends. As this was a case which admirably illustrates his character, we shall allow him to speak for himself at some length.

"I knew very well that, in taking this part, I was not acting much more agreeably to the late than to the present Ministry; and that I was provoking the strongest resentment of all the persons upon whom my ever being in office must depend. The King took the strongest possible interest for the Duke. The Prince of Wales had, in a letter written to Adam at the moment of the matter being first brought before the House, and which Adam showed me, stated that he considered an attack upon the Duke as an attack upon himself. That the Duke may himself one day ascend the throne is an event by no means improbable. I had fully considered all this, when I determined not to shrink from my duty, and to give my most sincere opinion to the House. . . There is nothing so injudicious as talking in the House of Commons of a man's own disinterestedness. It is a topic which the House, with great reason, hears dwelt on with the most impatience. I thought, however, that I might, on this occasion, be allowed to observe, that my vote did not concur with my interest: and I concluded my speech with these words:—'It has been observed by a learned gentleman (Burton, who was aged, blind, and childless) in this debate at the close of his speech, that he has nothing to hope for or to fear on this side of the grave. I cannot say the same thing. Not labouring under the same affliction that he does, and not arrived at the same period of life, I may reasonably be allowed, for myself, and for those who are most dear to me, to indulge hopes of prosperity which is yet to come. Reflecting, too, on the vicissitudes of human life, I may entertain apprehensions of adversity, and of persecution, which perhaps await me. I have however the heartfelt satisfaction to reflect, that it is not possible for me to hope to derive, in any way, the most remote advantage from the vote which I shall on this occasion give, and from the part which I have thought it my duty to act.'

"I have been told by several persons that, after making such a speech, I must give up all hopes of ever being Chancellor. I am not quite sure of that; but of this I think I may be sure, that if ever, after the part I have now taken, I should be raised to that situation, it will not be in expectation that I shall act in it otherwise than as an honest man. It is certainly not probable that I should receive such a promotion; nothing perhaps can be more improbable; but, if, contrary to all expectation, it should happen, the promotion will be more honourable to myself, and to the person to whom I shall be indebted for it, than it possibly could have been if, upon this occasion, I had adopted a different line of conduct."*

The length to which our extracts have already been carried will preclude us from anything more than an enumeration of the instances in which Sir Samuel Romilly shook himself free from the trammels of party when the strict line of public duty commanded. We refer especially to his conduct on the Freehold Estates' Bill, the Irish Insurrection Bill, the case of Sir Francis Burdett, and that of the Tellerships of the Exchequer. In a speech made at Bristol in 1812, he explained the principle which, in his opinion, should, in such cases, guide the conduct of the statesman. "He ought to be determined, whenever the men with whose political principles he in general agrees, and with whom he therefore generally acts, propose or support measures which, in his conscience, he disapproves, to oppose them just as if they were the measures of his political adversaries." In the present day, however, with a great portion of the country, an unflinching adherence to Party, through good measures and evil measures—as well as through good repute and ill repute,—is regarded as the first virtue in a public character; as it is certainly the most obvious, and the most easily appreciated by the world at large. We think Sir Samuel Romilly's principle is the correct one. It is true that to effect great measures men must act in concert, and in unison. It is true that this concert can rarely be obtained without mutual compromise, concession, and concealment. But to support, or even to refrain from opposing measures which a man believes to be absolutely noxious, simply because they are brought forward by his political friends, appears to us a distinct dereliction of moral principle, which enlarged views of public duty cannot justify, and assuredly will never command.

Many persons will be disposed to think that we have passed too high a eulogy upon what, after all, is but a clear and simple virtue. We are in general apt to undervalue this strict and firm integrity in public life, because we are not sufficiently aware of the obstacles which interfere with its exercise;—and yet its rarity might show the difficulty which attends its preservation. Sir Samuel Romilly's unflinching adherence to the straight and narrow path of duty, in defiance of temptations to which a temperament like his was most acutely sensible, will be most highly appreciated by those who are familiar with the sore and ceaseless trials which beset the virtue of the public man;—who know how easily the mind becomes inoculated with the prevailing laxity of the moral atmosphere around it,—how difficult it is to walk uprightly when every one else has a tortuous path, and a reeling step;—and what a vigorous effort is required to act upon principles by which your best friends and chosen associates have long ceased to be guided:—who know how painful it is to oppose in public life those whom you value and esteem in private life; and to refuse to partisans, who have gone far to serve you, favours which would cost you nothing, but your Country much; and who are too well aware what plausible and cogent reasons for every tempting oblivion of duty and every profitable deviation from rectitude, sophistry will always discover, in the importance of the object, in the interests of the party, in the example of the wise. And their approbation will be loudly expressed for the man who could pass through angry election contests, and the severest party struggles, without having to look back upon a single word, or a single action, "which, dying, he would wish to blot." And even those who survey from the quiet haven of retired life, the impetuous ambition, the stormy passions, and the selfish struggles of the public arena, will feel no common gratitude and reverence for him who, both by language and example, laboured to elevate that standard of political morality, the purity of which is at once the best safeguard, and the proudest distinction of a nation.

---

* On this subject we cannot refrain from quoting the following extract from a letter of Sir James Macintosh :—"I envy Romilly neither his fortune nor his fame, though I am likely to be poor and obscure enough, but I do envy him so noble an opportunity of proving his disinterestedness. If his character had been in the slightest degree that of a demagogue, his conduct might have been ambiguous; but, with his habits, it can only be considered as a sacrifice of the highest objects of ambition to the mere dictates of conscience. I speak so because, though he will not lose the great seal, yet I am sure he considered himself as sacrificing it; and to view it in any other light would be to rob him of the fame which he deserves."

The publication of the Life and sentiments of a man like Romilly, who not only in Parliament, but on the Hustings, dared to uphold an unyielding and dignified system of public principle, and had the rare courage to speak unpopular and unpleasant truths, is peculiarly opportune in times like these, during the prevalence of a low and shallow philosophy, which allows to public conduct a laxity which is denied to private, and permits or sanctions the violation of important principles to facilitate the attainment of important ends. It is during our elections—on our hustings—in the persons of our candidates, that this system may be found in its most pernicious form. We daily see men of unblemished reputation for private integrity,—men of sterling patriotic feeling, and undoubted liberality of sentiment,—who desire a seat in Parliament less for the gratification of individual ambition than because it will enable them more effectually to serve their country;—and yet who, in order to ensure success, will lay their conscience on Procrustes' bed,—will stretch or clip their genuine opinions to fit the popular caprice;—will carefully avoid obnoxious topics—evade home questions—listen meekly to insulting proposals—and promise a careful and favourable consideration to plans which they know in their hearts to be both noxious and absurd.

Conduct like this is in the last degree detrimental to the good cause. It is in defiance equally of every rule of sound morality, and every principle of enlarged wisdom. If such men succeed, their vote does not benefit their cause half so much as their shuffling injures it. If those who hold with Mr. Burke that there may be cases "in which Virtue will submit to a suspension of her own rules in favour of her own principles," would reflect on the *ultimate* consequences of such a time-serving system, they would discover that, in the final issue of things, he will be found to have been the best Patriot who is the best Christian; and that in their own individual case—however critical the juncture—however important each single suffrage—the country would suffer far less by their failure, than by the tarnished honour of a Statesman who swerves from that unflinching rectitude which should be the professed banner of his class, to cajole, to deceive, or to betray.

The error of these timid and unfaithful politicians is well characterised by Sir James Mackintosh, as "that of trying *single actions*, instead of habits, dispositions, and rules, by the standard of utility,—that of too easy an admission of the use of doubtful means, when the end seems to them good,—that of believing, unphilosophically as well as dangerously, that there *can* be any scheme or measure as beneficial to the state, as the mere existence of men who would not do a base act for any public advantage."

Integrity in public life is a quality of equal importance and equal dignity at all times; but its mode of manifestation will differ with the age. Public men are not now called upon to display it, like Regulus, by encountering a death of torture out of reverence to his pledged faith; but by a steady refusal to obtain ends which Virtue points to, by means which she cannot sanction;—by bowing to no popular clamour—by nourishing no popular delusion—by flattering no popular caprice;—but by sowing with courage the good seed, and waiting with patience till times and seasons shall have ripened an honourable harvest.

There is perhaps no point of Sir Samuel Romilly's character which excites a warmer admiration than the moral courage which induced him on all fitting occasions to speak the truth plainly and without reserve, careless alike of offending others, or of injuring himself; and which made his motto, not less truly than that of the German autocrat of Literature,—

> "Im ganzen, guten, wahren, resolut zu leben."

We are disposed to value this quality the more highly, because we believe the want of it to be the besetting sin of most Englishmen of our time, and to be fraught with instant peril to the cause of truth and freedom. Few indeed are the men who do not shrink from any banner which requires to be upheld at the hazard of popularity and worldly estimation;—and as truth is in the first instance generally unwelcome, and always the discovery of the minority, truth is eminently the sufferer by this unworthy backsliding. The prevalence of intellectual tyranny in this country, especially on subjects connected with religion, has long furnished matter for lament:—but we seldom enough consider that this is to be attributed no less to the moral cowardice of the few, than to the insolent assumption of the many. We exclaim against the oppression which would dictate to the consciences, and suppress the heresies of others; but we forget to stigmatize that want of manly independence which submits to, and by submission sanctions, the despotic treatment. If the oppressor is guilty of tyranny, the silent acquiescer in his oppression is guilty of a meaner sin. If those, whose habits of enlarged reflection and profound research have led them to worthier and wiser views of religious philosophy and its application to legislation and to social life, would on all suitable occasions defend and promulgate those views, with the courage of deep thought, and the seriousness of deep feeling;—if they would fearlessly raise the standard of that freedom of the mind which they profess to prize beyond wealth and worldly honours;—if, disdaining to humour the vulgar prejudices of the hour, they would boldly speak the truth, —*and speak it, not as a confession, but as a creed,*—they would find that thousands, who now acquiesce in a reluctant and discreditable silence, would eagerly crowd into their ranks. If we blame the men whom ignorance and weakness have made arrogant, what condemnation must be *theirs,* who, knowing the better and the brighter light, allow the fear of reproach to withhold them from labouring to diffuse it? Were the stronger talent and the deeper thought which have led them to nobler and to sounder views, given them to be buried in the grave of silence—or to be employed for the vindication of intellectual freedom, and the enlightenment of their less gifted brethen? Those men are eminently unfaithful to their trust who content themselves with enjoying in the quiet of the closet that truth which should be proclaimed from the house-tops.

The Memoirs of Sir Samuel Romilly not only set us an example—they show us the reward of virtue. Few men ever led a life of such cheerful and uniform happiness. Enjoying unequalled success in his profession—unequalled reverence in the Senate—and unsurpassed felicity in the domestic circle,—he had the additional delight of feeling that he owed everything to his own merit and exertion; and that his life was spent in the pursuit of objects the interest of which could never pall or languish. The man who toils for honour or emolument, or the splendid baubles of ambition, even in the midst of the most dazzling success, and in hours of most brilliant triumph, has an uneasy consciousness that the day is not far distant when the gilding will have tarnished and the interest have faded, and the passion died away; and when other objects of contemplation will be forced painfully upon him. But one who, like Romilly, devotes himself to the disinterested service of his race, has always present to his mind, alike in failure and success, the grateful conviction that his pursuits are of a nature which, as he approaches the confines of earthly existence, he will neither have to blush for, nor to change. We cannot deny ourselves the gratification of extracting the following beautiful prayer, which was written by Romilly in 1812:—

"Almighty God! Creator of all things! Source of all wisdom, and goodness, and virtue, and happiness! I bow down before thee—not to offer up prayers, for I dare not presume to think or hope that thy most just, unerring, and supreme will can be in any degree influenced by any supplications of mine,—nor to pour forth praises and adorations, for I feel that I am unworthy to offer them,—but in all humility, and with a deep sense of my own insignificance, to express the thanks of a contented and happy being, for the innumerable benefits which he enjoys. I cannot reflect that I am a human being, living in civilized society, born the member of a free state, the son of virtuous and tender parents, blest with an ample fortune, endowed with faculties which have enabled me to acquire that fortune myself, enjoying a fair reputation, beloved by my relations, esteemed by my friends, thought well of by most of my countrymen to whom my name is known, united to a kind, virtuous, enlightened, and most affectionate wife, the father of seven children all in perfect health, and all giving by the goodness of their dispositions a promise of future excellence, and though myself far advanced in life, yet still possessed of health and strength which seem to afford me the prospect of future years of enjoyment,—I cannot reflect on all these things and not express my gratitude to thee, O God! from whom all this good has flowed. I am sincerely grateful for all this happiness. I am sincerely grateful for the happiness of all those who are most dear to me, of my beloved wife, of my sweet children, of my relations, and of my friends.

"I prostrate myself, O almighty and omniscient God, before thee. In endeavouring to contemplate thy divine attributes, I seek to elevate my soul towards thee; I seek to improve and ennoble my faculties, and to strengthen and quicken my ardour for the public good; and I appear to myself to rise above my earthly existence, while I am indulging in the hope that I may at some time prove a humble instrument in the divine work of enlarging the sphere of human happiness."

We must now bring to a close observations which have, perhaps, already extended to an unwarrantable length. We had purposed to indulge in a few speculations as to the influence which Sir Samuel Romilly might have exercised on public events, had his life been prolonged to a later period. We had also wished to have touched upon certain points of contrast and of similarity between him and another public character of great virtue and celebrity. But we must conclude this imperfect attempt to delineate the excellencies of one of the purest and wisest statesmen of modern times, in the touching and beautiful apostrophe of the Roman philosopher:—"Si quis piorum manibus locus; si, ut sapientibus placet, non cum corpore extinguuntur magnæ animæ, placidè quiescas: nosque, domum tuam, ab infirmo desiderio et muliebribus lamentis, ad contemplationem virtutum tuarum voces, quas neque lugeri neque plangi fas est: admiratione te potius, temporalibus laudibus, et, si natura suppeditet, æmulatione decoremus. Is verus honos, ea conjunctissimi cujusque pietas."—*Tacitus. Agricolæ Vita.*

W. R. G.

Art. III.—SPAIN.

L'Espagne sous Ferdinand, par Le Marquis de Custine. Paris 1838.

La passion de voyager est pour l'esprit, ce que la fontaine de la Jouvence etoit pour le corps—Avec cette passion, la pensée ne s'use pas, elle se renouvelle comme les objets qui frappent les regards des curieux—*La curiosité c'est la vie*—la vie de l'intelligence.

The law of compensations obtains in the moral as well as in the physical world. Dr. Chalmers, in his Bridgwater treatise, has opened that subject, and given us the clue by which to read the apparent contradictions in the arrangements of society and moral being, with the faith and comfort with which we have at length learned to appreciate the apparent contradictions of the natural.

When Buffon, for instance, wrote his natural history, in the sneering sceptical spirit of his day, he could see nothing but the most lamentable mistake of nature, in the production of the sloth—*rebut de la nature*—miserable abortion of the earth, condemned to endure an existence of deformity, helplessness, and unsatisfied craving,—victim of famine, or with a voracity, to be satisfied only by the destruction of all vegetable nature—dragging his painful being from tree to tree, while his faint cries feebly expressed the perpetual sorrows of his heart.

Waterton, on the contrary, instead of painting a fish panting on the bank,—as a specimen of the wise provisions of nature, simply describes the same creature in the water, and nature is vindicated. He shows us this same sloth as the happy and useful inhabitant of the American forests,—this voracious feeder upon green leaves, in the midst of a world of foliage—beautifully constructed, (that is, as far as admirable adaptation to a given purpose is beautiful), clinging to the verdant branch on which his peaceful existence of dreaming plenty is to be passed, his inordinate appetite devoted to the task of clearing, by the death of the tree he has stripped, some small space, from time to time, in the green wilderness, through which the blue etherial heavens may be discerned, and the breath of life, the pure air from the space above, penetrate the dank, unwholesome shade.

Such is natural history, as read by the light of faith and truth, or scanned in the glimmering twilight of Atheism or Pantheism.

And as of the natural so of the moral world—of the study of history, in the past by records, in the present by travel:—of man in what he has done, and been,—of man in what he is doing and is—this clue will conduct our bewildered senses through this labyrinth of apparent errors, to the beauty and perfection which is its termination and its aim.

As one instance of the system of compensations, as applied to the moral world, we may mention the love, nay restless passion for travelling, with which the English seem smitten, and with which they are often reproached. It should be regarded but as one effect of the instinct which should lead old age, to drink of the fountain of Jouvence. Yes old age; for, unquestionably, we are the oldest, perhaps the only old people in Europe. For France, advanced as she is in many respects, and with all the incredulity and coldness which seems too often the concomitant of advancing years—is but in that apparent premature old age, brought on by exhausted passions, when the heart, disenchanted or fatigued, fancies it shall never be young again, and which the next striving event awakens to all the blind vehemence of adolescence. But with England it is not so; we are really advanced into Manhood—we have felt, thought, reflected, experienced; we have had centuries of manly action, while the rest of the world has been lying in continued infancy — we have exhausted thought, wearied ourselves with contemplation on things around us, till the mind, fatigued with dwelling on the same ideas, sinks into indifference or hardens into bigotry, the fate of most who grow old in a narrow circle of objects, on which they are perpetually exercising an active intellect. When lo! a compensation is offered. The Continent is opened, the fountain 'de la Jouvence' unsealed. Curiosity, that "life of the soul," revives—and forth we rush to see, to enjoy, to be young again. What pleasure can equal that which an intelligent, cultivated mind receives, on visiting a country entirely new; where every point presents something fresh, where each page as it is opened of the delightful romance offers something unexpected and strange—where the delightful childish feeling, what will come next? keeps every faculty alive — children with the capacities of manhood. As to children, every object in this new world is a source of the most fertile and lively sensations; our intellects expand, our spirits rise, the human heart within us swells with love to the vast brotherhood; we soon learn to recognize our common blood in all its various forms of being, and, more, we learn to reverence man, to honour him, and to hope for him; to see the law of love pervading the providences of society, as it does those of nature,—a law of progress prevailing—of good, and joy, and fruition, to be attained,—of evil exercise, of pain to warn, of consolations and compensations for the weary wayfarer on the difficult way,—consolation to the sufferer,—compensation to the unsuccessful, each condition with its fair side,—our task to cherish the fair, and obliterate the foul, a beautiful world of activity, hope, and progress,—a day of gleaming sun and fleeting clouds, the spring time of the future year.

M. de Custine is a lively and interesting person, not without his prejudices or predilections, but avowing them with perfect good faith. A lover of the old rather than a hoper from the new, his imagination dwells with fond reverence upon that which remains to us of days more generous and imaginative than our own, and he deprecates any hasty levelling of all this infinite variety, any rash attempt to obliterate these relics of ancient beauty—he is not only a conservative, but he is also a catholic, and, to our protestant understandings, many of his reasonings upon subjects in which his religious opinions bear a part, have that character of inconsistency and error which is the fate of those who have to defend, however sincerely, that which is in itself false.

Such as he is, a catholic, and a royalist, but an honest man, he paints us Spain, as it appeared to him in 1835. His pictures are lively, and we will present a few of them to the reader, handing a glass of the sweet fountain of Jouvence to those whose circumstances prevent their drinking from the living stream.

Spain! what a field for reflection is this table-land—this garment of frieze with fringe of gold—this peninsula severed from Europe by the Pyrenees—from Africa by the straits—this disputable land of two continents, of two zones, of two vegetations, of two civilisations, of the south and the north! The oak, the elm, the vine, orange, olive and palm—the Goth, the Arab, the Christian and the Moor! This mother of enterprise, dark amid the general light; this pioneer of Europe, behindhand with every one! This Queen of Christianity smothered amid the fires of her Auto da fé; Charles the 5th and Ximenes in a remote age; Ferdinand embroidering petticoats in a recent one; beautiful Valencia—melancholy Castile—Andalusian *Majos*—squalid beggars—Spirit, life, elegance, and joy,—darkness, feebleness, robbery and desolation! What a gorgeous arabesque! it reminds one of those rich arabesques of the Vatican where grinning monsters, and smiling cupids, with white doves—and taloned eagles, flowers, fruits, scrolls, hippogriffs, chimeras, angels, are all mingled in beautiful and inextricable confusion.

To hear an old soldier of Napoleon, as I did yesterday, describe Spain—" les melons delicieux, les pasteques, les olives, deux recoltes, mademoiselle, par an, le blé et puis aussitôt que cela est recolté le blé de Turquie, les fruits abondans, et si delicieux, — Oh ! les melons gros comme ça pour un sols, les pasteques !—Oh Mademoiselle c'est un riche pays que l'éspagne !"

And after such a description let any one suddenly be dropped in the plains of Old Castile.—Mournful, silent, no tree to break the melancholy uniformity,—withering beneath the sun—deserts of short grass—the prey of millions and millions of sheep, which like the locusts of Egypt make war upon every green thing—not a bird enlivens the air, no shade, no change, no sound,—the shepherd in his brown mantle leaning upon his long staff, pastor, or brigand, as the humour may be, the sole inhabitant of these dreary regions—these plains sacrificed to the tyrannical law of the Mesta.

Yet even here change but the time of year, and nature, transformed as in a dream, presents one wilderness of beauty.

> " Dans la saison ou nous sommes (2d May)—les plateaux du centre de l'Espagne se revêtent a râz de terre d'une verdure admirable. An immense multitude of flowers of all the numerous families of plants, of the sweetest odours and most brilliant colours, change these plains into one delicious flower garden—these aromatick steppes, with their enormous bushes of lavender, their cistus's, their lucernes, their wild lupins, their arbutus, their wild thymes, their sweet herbs, their millions and millions of flowering shrubs, are like a rich turkey carpet spread beneath the azure ceiling of a mosque."

What a garden for that happiest of all human beings—a botanist.

A child in the fields in spring in all their affluence of yellow—king-cups, blue veronicas, purple orchis's, need not envy Solomon all his glory. The botanist roaming in the fields of Castile need not envy the child.

And what society is to be found in these tracts, alternately beautiful as the Elysium fields or disconsolate as the dreary Tartarus?

Contrast again—you enter the thinly scattered towns (we are now in La Mancha) more like heaps of mud ruins than anything else.

> " The town of Mançanares is the dirtiest among them all ; its streets the most desolate ; its houses the most miserable."

And what sort of a population are we to expect to find herding among these hideous assemblages of filth and mire ? A people as miserable and squalid as they ? Not in the least.

> "A strong and handsome race—well dressed, more especially on the Sundays—in this respect, at least, equalling our own peasantry; but in nobility of feature, language and attitude, unrivalled by any peasantry in Europe."

Swarms of beggars are mingled with this handsome, well-dressed and high-spirited people, their insolence only on a par with their destitution, and their hilarity with their apparent misery.

The Marquis laments over this universal mendicancy, and calls it the scourge of Christianity—it is, like other scourges, attributed to that much abused name, the result of error with regard to the principles of action which it really enjoins.

The Mestà is now at an end—an institution wrung by a few interested nobles from a feeble and ignorant government, it has rendered the centre of Spain little better than a desert. These sheep to whom so much has been sacrificed have devoured the country.

> "Flocks of from 1,200 to 2,000 sheep are to be seen conducted by five or six shepherds and a few dogs;—they travel from one province to another to enjoy according to the season the most fitting temperature—these privileged animals travel from estate to estate over land let to their proprietors for this purpose—it is a species of plague like that of the locusts of Egypt. When one part of the Peninsula was at war with another, it had only to throw its hordes of sheep and goats upon the enemy's country, and the fields, rendered barren by the bite of these animals, bore long witness to the passions of mankind. Estremadura, which has suffered the most from this species of invasion, is capable of containing two millions of inhabitants: her actual population amounts to about five hundred thousand—such is the result of these invasions of the shepherd kings."
>
> "Under Charles the 5th and Philip the 2nd, the number of travelling sheep amounted to seven millions. Ustariz, who wrote in the beginning of our century, calculates them at four or five millions; add to this eight millions of animals that are stationary and do not travel, and you will have between twelve and thirteen millions of this woolly tribe. And it will no longer be difficult to account for the vast uncultivated plains half covered with brambles which form a desert in the centre of Spain."

The Mesta, or right of pasturage on the way for the travelling flocks, was confined to a few of the grandees, and chiefly exercised in Estremadura, part of Andalusia, La Mancha, and the two Castilles. One of its most odious privileges, was the right arrogated by the proprietor of a travelling flock, in perpetuity, to the temporary occupation of land once let for this purpose, either to himself, or to his ancestors, for the pasturage of the flocks on their journeys, provided the rent was regularly paid, a ceremony never omitted, as the grandee was rich, and the rents for the most part had become merely nominal. How could the peasant proprietor of land subjected to these ravages be expected to resist the discouragement thus occasioned?—The result has been, that cultivation being gradually given up, the country has become deserted, and the few inhabitants who yet remain taking the matter into their own hands and endeavouring to repair one injustice by another, have abandoned themselves to brigandage.

The peasant goes armed to his field, ready for defence, or offence, as the case may be.

> " A waggoner in Andalusia does not travel two leagues with his goods without an escort.—He goes well armed himself, to resist the brigands, of whose society it is ten to one in the course of a year or two he will become a member. This population, always in a state of warfare, these capricious combatants, armed sometimes for the defence, at others to attack society, and usually provided with no good reason for the part they may be pleased to take, are like no other peasantry in Europe. Here every man takes his part for good or evil according to the feeling of the moment, never bothering himself with considerations of the right or the wrong—the church or the road—monk or brigand. One of the two professions is open to every one, and very little distinction, as far as the feelings of moral approbation are concerned, seems to be made between the two."

The Sierra Morena separates La Mancha from Andalusia.

> " The descent of the Sierra Morena towards the kingdom of Jaen," says M. de Castine, " is beautiful; still the effect it produced upon me was scarcely equal to its reputation . . . . I expected to look down upon the whole course of the Guadalquivir, and to see the beautiful river unrolled as it were beneath my feet . . . I found only one peak of much elevation, and the view from it was the same as that from any other mountain. However, between these fine rocks I caught some views of considerable beauty—the eye plunging into the deep valleys of these calcareous rocks,—their sides rent by huge projecting masses of marble, more interesting to the naturalist than to the painter. As to the river of Chivalry, I saw nothing of it till I entered the principal valley of Andalusia."

The change of scene is now striking:—

> " A man has travelled forty leagues in La Mancha, perhaps without seeing a tree, or tasting one drop of pure water: as he crosses the Sierra he finds himself transported, as it were, into a rich botanical garden, the trees and flowers of the south, ranged upon the rocks in gradual succession, forming natural terraces upon which each family finds its place, its

proper elevation, soil, and temperature. It is a magical garden, grand and beautiful—the very stones seem influenced by the universally spreading spirit of life, and are covered with lichens, whose golden and scarlet tints add to the splendid effect of the landscape—la Nature parait factice tant elle a de symétrie et d'élégance."

Having passed Venta-de-Cardenas, he thus describes this delightful country: it must be recollected that he is travelling in the month of May, two months later, and the whole will be obscured with dust, and withering under a burning sun.

It is impossible to translate descriptions of this sort into English—we give it in the original words.

"Passé la Venta-de-Cardenas, on entre dans une gorge boise. Lá les liéges aux formes pittoresques, aux branches pendantes comme celle des saules, les caroubiers, à la verdure éclatante, se mêlent à des pâles oliviers, à de longues allées d'aloès bleuâtres, et chaque massif d'arbustes est entouré de touffes de cystes blancs à larges fleurs, assez semblables aux roses de magnolia mais moins grandes. J'ai vu des montagnes entières couvertes d'une autre espéce de cyste fleuri les fleurs en sont lilas, et inodores—le cyste à petites fleurs blanches et jaunes, dont la gomme aromatique embaume l'air, d'un parfum tout méridional, est aussi fort commun dans ces parages. La route passe à travers des champs de lavande fleurie, plus forte et plus odorante que celle de nos jardins . . . J'ai remarqué des champs de fraisiers en arbres, entoures de haies d'ormes et de charmes auxquels se melent l'aloés et le nopal plante bizarre éspece de corail végétal qui contraste d'une manière pittoresque avec les productions de nos climats."

The vegetation of the more northern Europe, he adds, is only of a lively green (begging his pardon, in England at least, and in the districts of the oak, mountain ash, and willow hoar, it is, in spring, of every variety of red, golden, green, and grey), "here, the trees of our own country, with their monotonous green, make an agreeable variety mingled with the bluer tints of the plants belonging to the torrid zone; it seems as if nature had worked under the direction of an *accomplished botanist*, to unite in one picture all the various forms of the vegetable kingdom.—One is dazzled with the splendour of the colours, ravished by the sweetness of the perfumes."

No doubt of it, Nature does work under the inspiration of a great artist; of the Divine fountain of beauty and order—what pictures! what inimitable groupings! what colourings! what effects! what harmony of sounds, sights, smells, are presented every hour to her delighted children—beauty for the sense, order, arrangement, system, classification, for the intellect—inexhaustible beauty—inexhaustible system—page after page of the rich book of knowledge to be unfolded before our eyes—every fresh page increasing in interest as we proceed.

It is not in what is so *directly* useful, as in what may seem of little apparent utility, that a thinking mind sees the extreme goodness of God;—colours and music, said one who was no fool, make one *adore* God.

This is a fruitful never-ending theme, this hymn of universal Nature—this lesson of artistical beauty—written as if to reprove the heartless errors of that man,—who would condemn the study of art and beauty as unworthy of a Christian; but we will not be seduced by it at present.

One other picture and we will have done.

"Je verrai toute ma vie un petit ravin que j'ai aperçu entournant un rocher de marbre couleur de cuivre. Nous descendions la pente d'un chemin bordé de précipices, tout à coup je découvre à mes pieds un vallon de Normandie. Il regnait la une verdure que je croyais apartenir uniquement à nos tristes climats; une cascade nourrissait les racines d'un bois de frênes; tandis que des flancs du rocher le pampre s'elancait sur ces arbres du nord, ou la vigne en guirlandes semblait avoir eté oubliée aprés une fète; le balancement des festons de verdure jetés comme des filets sur la cime des arbres, les parfums du thym, du cyste, et du baume, les saules, les pommiers en fleurs, les peupliers, les ormes mêlés aux orangers aux grenadiers me paraissaient transplantées lá de tous des pays, comme pour encenser le pouvoir qui les avait crées."

Not so—not alone as incense to God, but as delight to man, do all these odours rise. The Almighty, hidden in his dark pavilion, teaches us by types and parables—that not his own glory, but the happiness of his creatures, has been the end of his beneficent teeming creation. And there should this good Catholic learn, that no worship or adoration can be acceptable to the all good, purchased at the expense of happiness to his creatures. And there should some of our own religionists learn to speak and to think more nobly of the God who hideth himself, than to believe that all things were made only for his glory.

The population inhabiting these delightful regions are picturesque and beautiful as themselves; their elegant forms, dark eyes, expressive features, and olive skin, all speak of the children of a warm and genial sky. The costumes are various, but always graceful and striking—the young chevaliers on horseback have the air of the paladins of old—"leur demarche aussi gracieuse aussi libre que l'allure de leurs coursiers ardalons." As a specimen of the beauty and richness of their costume, M. de Custine describes what he calls un *dandy rustique* who had just passed before him in the streets of Cordova.

"A grey beaver hat, the crown in sugar-loaf shape, the rim of the hat turned up on each side, and bound with narrow black velvet; on one side of the hat a tassel of black silk, like a dark scabious, gives effect to the head-dress,—a short vest of green velvet laced with gold at the button-holes, and ornamented with pendant gold tags,—the lower garment of white leather ornamented with an embroidery of green braid. At the garters knots of a similar colour. Leather gaiters, richly embroidered with silk, left unbuttoned at the calf of the leg, complete this brilliant costume, which, brilliant and theatrical as it appears, is that of the smallest little proprietor; the man who can just live without labour, or by the labour of two or three days in the week, is for the rest of the time clothed much in the fashion of the young chevalier that I have just described."

The horse of this young paladin, of the beautiful Andalusian breed, *fier et doux,* had his mane ornamented with ribbons matching the colours of his master's dress. A Turkish saddle and large Barbary stirrups completed the set out.

"This elegant young gentleman, his cigar in his mouth, indolently traversed the streets of Cordova, and I defy," says M. de Custine, "the least imaginative of travellers to forbear composing some romance in which this striking apparition shall bear a part."

"Beside this graceful but fantastic figure, at the foot of some Moorish portico," (he is in Cordova,) "upon some wide and almost deserted *place,* where the solitary palm-tree waves over the ruins below, you perhaps see troops of beggars assembled, who have almost lost the appearance of human creatures. A disgusting, obstinate, impudent race, to be found in no other country but Spain, and rendered immortal by the pencil of Murillo, and the pen of Lesage."

"A step beyond you come perhaps to a Posada; you find a *halte de voyageurs* armed to the teeth, whose carabines, horses, clothes, features, are equally unlike anything to be seen in any other quarter of Europe."

To complete the romantic picture it must be added that the women of Arab descent live in the eastern manner, separated from the men—their dark eyes gleaming through their trellissed windows on the gay chevaliers glancing by.

We will now proceed with M. de Custine to visit Seville. "Quien no ha vista Sevilla no ha vista maravilla."

The first aspect of Seville however disappoints. The same picture presented by every town in Spain presents itself again—that is to say, edifices in a taste rather to be called barbaresque than gothic,—narrow, confused, twisted ill-paved streets, small insignificant squares, and walls *dentelées comme une scie.* The effect is picturesque enough, but after all that had been said one expected more. Such magnificence, such prodigies of art, such chef d'œuvres of the imagination had been promised. A man feels that he has been deceived—he complains of the everlasting exaggeration of travellers, and curses his own insatiable curiosity or credulity which has led him so far for nothing at all. Nevertheless, out of pure shame, in spite of his ill-humour, he must take a look at the cathedral—and once seen there is an end of his complaints and ill humour at once.

This astonishing work of human art—the labour of ninety consecutive years—the glory of many successive reigns—four hundred and twenty feet in length, two hundred and sixty-three in breadth, and of an elevation of proportional magnificence—seen from the borders of the Guadalquivir, its roof covered with pinnacles, resembles " a forest of pines planted upon the sharp peaks of a rocky mountain."

The interior is composed of fine naves, the centre one of prodigious height. " On est sous une Montagne creuse. Aprés tant d'années de voyages tout d'habitudes de la surprise, je ne me serais pas cru susceptible d'une emotion aussi vive que celle que j'ai eprouve en entrant sous cette voute vraiment chretienne." I imagine—a *valley reversed,* the depth of which forms the nave, supported by the trunks of ancient venerable trees ; all is grand, severe, sublime, like the God to whom it is devoted.

The choir is much elevated, and separated by a lofty gilt railing, the ascent by a splendid flight of steps. This elevation gives great effect to the splendid ceremonial of the Catholic religion here administered by whole crowds of gorgeous priests—" cette espéce de Montagne sainte, batie sous de voutes, produit un effet pittoresque qui rappelle les pompes de la nature et ce souvenir du monde exterieur ajoute aux solemnités du culte." " No where, not even at Rome, have the Catholic ceremonies appeared to me invested with a majesty like that I find in this noble sanctuary. The first day I entered it was Sunday—a crowd of priests attending at the celebration of the mass, lost as it were under the gigantic arches that swelled above the assembled population of Seville, filled the nave ; and certainly a sublime and glorious spectacle it is. A rich, ancient and immense cathedral crowded with a devout and serious multitude, the organ rolling forth its volumes of sound like the deep music of the winds—the splendid altar—the assembled chanting priests—the flowers, the lights, the clouds of incense visible through the rich twilight cast by the crimson and deep blue painted windows,—a Catholic cathedral is indeed a splendid record of the arts, the taste, the sentiments of ages far more imaginative than our own— built up by the piety of the middle ages out of the traditions and the ruins of the exquisite taste of Roman and Grecian art, and the gorgeous splendour of the temple worship at Jerusalem.

And though, no doubt, as once was said, a poor covenanter in peril and privation worshipping his God upon the wild mountain is a spectacle still more sublime, one cannot but respect too that sentiment of a good Catholic—the origin no doubt of this splendour that nothing is too good to be offered unto God—and one cannot but admire the splendour of art, painting, statuary, and architecture devoted to his shrine, and spread out in lavish magnificence for the enjoyment of the mass of the people.

It was from its dedication to purposes like these no doubt that art drew the correct simplicity which gives that inexpressible charm to the works of her period of glory. It is vain to expect that man can work with the same noble enthusiasm to adorn the palace of a noble as to dedicate his work in the temple of the Lord. Art has expired with that warm feeling of devotion. Much no doubt has been gained since those days in many ways; but when we balance it against what has been lost, a secret discouragement creeps upon the soul. Let us however at least reverence these vestiges of other and more genial days; and while we cast light upon the superstition that defiled, endeavour to preserve these solemn temples themselves to the holy worship of the giver of all good, and the purpose, as holy, of lifting and raising the thoughts of the common man, at moments at least, from the sordid cares of clay. M.

IDOLATRY.

"Thou thoughtest that I was altogether such a one as thou thyself."

Father, forgive Thy people! ever prone
Thy worship to forsake—to other Gods
Paying the homage due to Thee alone!—

Oft did the Israelites, Thy chosen ones,
Neglect Thy holy altars, and with heart
Unfaithful, on the silent mountain top,
Or in the shady forest, bend in prayer
To wood and stone—forgetful of thy hand
Whose power alone lifted the heights sublime
To guard their fertile land and point to heaven,
Whose goodness spread the green and silent shades
For their repose.—Yet, holy Father, still
Thou didst proclaim Thyself a gracious God,
Kind and long-suffering—still upon their heads
Didst pour the radiant sun, the genial shower,

Leading their steps, and in a pleasant place
Causing their lines to fall.
And now, O God!
Tho' with fresh mercies blest—tho' we no more
Seek on this earth our final resting-place,
But from its pleasant homes and flowery glades
Look up to a still fairer home in heaven;—
And though Thou callest us Thy children now,
Bidding us share Thy choicest gifts, and come
To Thine own courts, in blest communion there
With Thee to dwell—still with ungrateful heart
The Christian turns away—and even for this
O Father! offers not his thanks to Thee.

See, through the dusky air the taper sends
Its twinkling light—the pious traveller
Blesses the ray, and meekly at the shrine
He kneels—but on his lips thy holy name,
O God, we do not hear—for to a Saint,
Weak like himself, he prays, and Thee forgets.

On sunny seas the rowers ply their oars,
And with soft mingling voices breathe a song
Of gratitude—but not, O God, to Thee!
"Ave Maria, sanctissima," they sing—
And through the Virgin Mother, seek their God.

Hark! thro' the pillar'd aisle the organ pours
Its solemn sounds—the hymn of praise ascends,
And now they cease—and the hush'd multitude
Kneeling, the white-rob'd priest begins the prayer—
"O Lamb of God that tak'st away our sins,
Grant us thy peace"—and in low murmurs now
The kneeling crowds reply, "Have mercy on us."
Thus unto him they turn, Thy gracious gift—
To him they cling—the Giver is forgot.

Father, forgive thy people! praying thus
With zeal but not with knowledge. Yet we know
Thou art a jealous God, and wilt not give
Thy glory to another—Hasten then
The happy time when all shall worship Thee
In truth, and treading in the Saviour's steps,
Address their prayers, Father, to Thee alone.
And grant unto the little flock who pay
An undivided homage to Thy name,
Grace to adorn the doctrine of their God.
Called out of darkness into wondrous light,
O may we walk as children of the light,
And ne'er forget that to whom much is given
Of him the righteous Judge will much require!

Art. IV.—PRACTICAL REMARKS ON THE EDUCATION OF THE PEOPLE. By A Schoolmaster. No. 1.

It is a happy circumstance that we come to the consideration of what the Education of the People ought to be, furnished with the results of inquiries and experiments which during the last half century have done something to elevate Education to the precision and dignity of a moral science; for during this period not only has the importance of the interests which it involves been deeply felt, but eminent mental power, and the purest impulses of benevolence, have been again and again employed in laudable efforts to arrive at the true theory of Education, and a few individuals,—dissatisfied with the existing methods of procedure—intensely anxious to find a better path,—have risen superior to current prejudices, burst the trammels of established custom, and worked their own way to a practice which cannot have entirely failed of success, and gives every promise of suitable improvements because it is founded on nature, on the study of the laws which regulate human life, and on a careful attention to the interests and duties which lie before the human being. And it is only in the degree in which such a course is pursued, in which philosophy shall carry forward the science, and practice perfect the art of education, in which the theorist and the schoolmaster shall reciprocate their several discoveries, and each give and take modifications and expansions of their ideas and observances—that Education will cease to be, as it has so long been, a mere blind routine, a tenacious adherence to customary methods, a system of quackery which in matters of far less importance would long since have been exploded;—and become a system of principles, of principles going forth into well considered rules, and of well considered rules reduced to wise and consistent practice. This is a consummation devotedly indeed to be wished. It is a consummation, moreover, which every intelligent mind can do something to accelerate. Here, as in many other cases, industry without genius will effect more than genius without industry; and it is in the power of the humblest educator to contribute to the improvement of both the science and the art if only he will use his eyes and use his mind, follow up his observations by experiment, and qualify his practice by his discoveries.

The history of Pestalozzi is a striking exemplification of these remarks. I am not myself an implicit believer in Pestalozzi, but I am free to declare that I rank him among the great lights and benefactors of my kind; and yet his work was wrought out in and through difficulties, to encounter which few men would have been equal.

Henry Pestalozzi was born at Zurich in the year 1745, of honourable but poor parents. Deprived of his father at an early age, he was left to the care of his other parent, whose circumstances were painfully narrow. If we may judge by the *sobriquet* of *Harry Oddity* which he bore, eccentricity seems to have been a marked feature in his early character, which in other respects was distinguished rather for kindness and gentleness than strength or precision of intellect. A deep dissatisfaction with existing modes of education, resulting from the working of his own mind, was increased as well as strengthened by the study of that mixture of good sense and extravagance, the *Emile* of Rousseau. The work confirmed him in the pursuit of what I may term educational truth, and gave a stimulus to his inquiries, but communicated to him no other positive knowledge than that of his own ignorance and of the prevalent ignorance and poverty on the subject. A severe illness, the result of the intense action of his mind, ended in bringing him to a fixed determination to abandon himself, as his Biographer terms it, "to the education of Providence." He apprenticed himself to a farmer; in due time made himself master of a tract of waste land, applied himself to its cultivation, became interested in a cotton manufactory, and still pursuing his favourite study was by the experience through which he went in these concerns, led to the settled conviction that the prevailing system of popular education was not fitted to prepare men for either the duties or the pleasures of life. He resolved on an educational experiment. He selected his pupils from the very dregs of the people. His establishment was converted into an asylum in which 50 orphan or pauper children were provided with food, clothing, and instruction. His object was national, and it was his desire to show, not how the State might provide for the poor and correct them, but how it might enable the poor to provide for and correct themselves. Hence one of his great principles—self-education. He wished to lead his pupils to purify their affections and to substitute intelligence in the place of cunning and ignorant routine. As yet however his knowledge of human nature was unequal to the task which he undertook. His plan was defeated, but not without having been attended with beneficial results to upwards of 100 children, and a great increase of experience to himself, which he communicated to the world in works which were as attractive as they were instructing. After passing through a cloud of difficulties, Pestalozzi under the aid of the government entered on another educational experiment in circumstances of the most unfavourable nature both within and without the establishment. Deprived however of all the ordinary props of authority he was led to throw himself on the power of love in the children's heart as the only available source of obedience. The effect was answerable to the wisdom of the appeal. The whole of his school apparatus consisted of himself and his pupils. How was he to instruct them? The practical answer to this question—not wrought out till after many trials and many failures—led him to discoveries new to the world as well as to himself, and valuable alike to both, though undoubtedly tinged with a degree of German mysticism, and more practicable in the hands of the master himself than in those of any of his imitators. He was led to teach by word of mouth instead of books; by numbers instead of ciphers, living sounds instead of dead characters, deeds of faith and love instead of abstruse creeds; realities instead of signs. " From morn to night he was in the midst of his pupils. To him they owed every comfort and every enjoyment, and whatever hardships they had to endure, he was their fellow sufferer. He partook of their meals and slept among them. In the evening he prayed with them, and from his conversation they dropped into the arms of slumber. His voice it was which called them to the light of the rising sun and the worship of the power which sends him forth in his daily mission. He wept when they wept, he rejoiced when they rejoiced; he was to them a father, and they were to him as children."

A war broke up his establishment. His circumstances were embarrassed, his mind embarrassed still more. Ridicule assailed him with rude assaults. Yet he persevered, and under the passion which ruled his life, became an assistant in a dame school. Soon however a wider sphere opened before him. The Swiss Government having given him a small pension, gave him also an old castle in which to pursue his plans of education. But it was an empty castle. Rooms there were in abundance, every thing necessary for an establishment, but money, furniture, pupils and teachers. He proceeded to work, and ere long called them all into existence. The school at Burgdorf was soon a scene of busy activity, training disciples and educators as well as children, and becoming by means of his publications and the gradual disseminations of his plans and principles, a centre of light to the civilized world. He had however by the liberality of his spirit and teachings wounded the aristocratical spirit of a Canton " which was accustomed to vote annually sums of money for the maintenance of a family of bears whose blood, uncontaminated by any intermarriage with common brutes of their species, reaches to the same antiquity as the noblest pedigree of the republic." Removal became necessary. Thus driven from

Berne he accepted an offer made him by the Canton de Vaud, and established himself in the Castle of Yoerdon. Here again he was supplied with nothing but bare walls and beautiful scenery. Soon was the place a busy and a happy spot, for here he realised his great purpose and made his school a Christian family. Never perhaps has the idea of domestic life been more beautifully realised, never the effect of a Christian family more powerfully illustrated, than in this establishment, in which persons of all ages, of all ranks, of all nations, persons of the most different gifts and abilities and of the most opposite characters, were united together by that unaffected love which Pestalozzi, now in years, a man verging to the grave, but in heart a genuine child, seemed to breathe out continually and to impart to all that came within his circle.

But Pestalozzi was more fitted to theorise, and originate than to work out his own ideas into solid and permanent results. His last establishment fell to pieces for want, not of a pure and benevolent spirit, not of just principles, not of self-denying devotement—it had these things—but of a presiding mind capable of commanding authority, adjusting differences, and generally sustaining its own creations.

Much however as he did for the world, he reaped the reward of his own labours only so far as he felt an inward satisfaction at the remembrance of his efforts, sacrifices and achievements. He died in the midst of disappointments and mortifications at the advanced age of eighty. He would deserve to be held in lasting respect if he had done no more than bring forth in prominent relief those principles of his system which teach that a child's knowledge should be based on the evidence of his senses, that education should be a calling forth and a development of the inner man, and that discipline should consist in the fostering and refining influence of a wise and affectionate gentleness, or to express briefly the tenor of his doctrines, that Nature should be the guide, and Christianity the spirit, of every teacher of the young.

With this example before us, we cannot fail to be encouraged in proceeding to consider what popular education ought to be, or, in any attempt which circumstances may prompt or permit, to give our convictions effect in actual practice.

The first principle that I would lay down, is that popular education, as education of all kinds, should have a respect to the faculties. Education is the calling, or rather the leading out of the capabilities of the human being. If this is so, the name declares the office. Education is development. Development of what? of some of the human faculties? That is but a partial education. It is realising the contemplated good only in a certain degree. It is not education, but merely one process or more of education. Education in its very nature regards the whole man. Its universality is also involved in the nature of the being for whom it is designed. Whom do you propose to educate? Man. If we were consulting about the training of an inferior creature, we should be limited by the nature of the subject to a partial effort. In the hound we should aim to carry the scent to perfection; fleetness in the race-horse; sagacity in the carrier pigeon. These are the qualities which are useful to man, and are improveable under the fostering direction of his mind. But in the human being all the faculties alike require attention, and all are either useful or ornamental, contributing, when educated, in smaller or greater measures, to the good of the individual and the good of society. A well-developed frame of body is not only beautiful to the eye, but promotive of health and vigour, and is also the only shrine in which mental and moral perfection can be called forth with certainty, or be entrusted without peril. Then why should the mind be educated and the heart left in neglect?—or why should the moral faculties be developed and the mental be passed over? Such omission requires a reason. If we are possessed of a field we till it. If we have wealth we put it out to use. Any one who neglected to improve these opportunities would feel self-condemned, and condemned in the eyes of the world—unless he could assign an adequate reason. Where then is the excuse for neglecting the culture of any of our faculties? It needs no argument to show that all and each of our faculties ought to be cultivated, the burden of argument and the obligation of an apology lie with those who suffer any of them to remain undeveloped. But why were these faculties given? Was not the eye designed for sight? the feet for locomotion? Is the design of nature less obvious in respect of the mental and moral powers? Does not the faculty imply the obligation, and the power demand the use? The voice of nature in requiring the culture of the mind is even stronger than when she bids us develope the body. To a great extent, the education of the body she has, so to say, taken into her own hands. Her all but unaided efforts suffice at least to fit the bodily frame for those offices which are requisite for self-preservation. But nature in her own immediate effects is little else than a step-mother to the mind. She brings it into being, but for the most part leaves it to its own resources. Yet has she richly endowed it with germs of power. The seed is in the soil—but it requires the care, the sunshine, the rain and dews of wise benignity. Let it receive these, the harvest is ample and goodly. Withhold them, the seed perishes, the soil is overrun with weeds, and instead of luxuriance and beauty you have foulness and desolation. Can it be right that these elements of power and happiness should be lost? The inevitable conclusion is general. It embraces all our capabilities. There is no exception. And as all the faculties are but parts of one whole, we are warranted in presuming that the neglect of any one must be injurious to the whole. A partial culture involves not merely a negation of good in respect of the neglected capabilities, but a positive evil to the entire character, and specifically to those capacities which are developed. The human being is a complicated machine, which for its well-being requires the effectual and proportionate operation of each particular part. Let any one part be inert, the machine is less effective; perhaps it becomes deranged in its general working, and not improbably the action even of the minutest portion is essential to the operation of the highest order of its movements. But should the neglect be in the moving or the regulating power—what but evil can ensue? In man the mind and the heart are the moving and the regulating power. And indeed when we use these analogies, and speak of the different faculties, we fail in putting the question in the fulness of its strength. Properly speaking, these faculties are nothing more than different states, different modes of action of the same indivisible man. An individual signifies, by the etymology of the word, that which cannot be divided. If then you neglect any one of these states—these modes of action, you so far neglect the individual; you deprive him of power, you leave him defective. He is, through your omissions, curtailed in his resources, as it were maimed in the members of his mental frame. Strangely inconsistent sometimes are human sympathies. There are few who do not feelingly deplore the privations which the blind and the deaf endure—and I fear almost as few who look with any thing but indifference, or a slight and transient regret on those who suffer under a far greater calamity, that of blindness of mind, and dullness and insensibility of heart. If however it is admitted that we ought to educate the human being, it is also admitted that all his capabilities should be objects of our culture. The good derivable from education can then only be enjoyed when education and not a part of education has been undergone. As is the capital employed, so are the returns;—as is the effort, so the result. If you train the mind and neglect the body, the frame is weak, perhaps sickly, and the mental momentum inconsiderable. If you leave the mind inert and keep the body in full exercise, you produce little better than a powerful animal. If you call forth the power of the mind but fail to discipline and form the character, you have force but not effectiveness for the business of actual life. So, if you omit the culture of the imagination, you close up an avenue of the purest pleasure, and seal a fountain of the highest and most affectionate impulse; if you let the feelings remain unregulated and uncontrolled, you realize the classical fable of the winds which, when uncurbed by Æolus, burst forth from their prison and carried devastation over sea and land. My conclusion is that education must—to deserve the name—to answer the needful purposes, regard the whole man,—every possible state in which his powers may be or act; must regard the body, the mind, the judgment, the feelings, the imagination; alike those faculties by which man is related to the earth on which he is placed, to the futurity for which he is fitted and destined, to the fellow mortals by which he is surrounded; in other words, you must educate him so that he may discharge the duties which he owes to himself, those which he owes to his kind, and those which he owes to his Creator; or, still to vary the point of view, you must educate him so that he may enjoy all the happiness of which he is capable alike in his personal, social, and everlasting relations.

This is the first axiom in Education. Another—which immediately results from it, is, that Education is discipline, and must be entered on and pursued as discipline—the discipline of the faculties. Too many make Education to consist in certain outward results; a dexterity of the lips or the fingers. Can a boy read or write? If so, he is educated; if he cannot, he is uneducated. But a high education may be given, apart from this mere mechanical skill. Let me not be misunderstood. I am not speaking against this ability: it is needful;—but endeavouring to lead the reader's thoughts to a higher attainment—to one great end of Education, to its very essence. Education is in the training of the powers and emphatically in the training of the mental and moral capacities. Many persons have no idea of Education but so far as it appears in certain external acts, has an immediate bearing on the common pursuits of business, enables a youth to enter a counting-house, or transact the duties of the shop, or compute the earnings of the loom. A good education—true education, while it does not neglect these results, aims at far higher effects—effects for which the majority have no eye, no estimate, no desire; it aims at the perfecting of human nature, at strengthening and harmonizing the powers, at quickening and purifying the mental vision, controlling and sweetening the affections of the heart,—at bringing the whole man into full, energetic, and well-balanced action. And this it aims at not merely nor so much for any ulterior purpose, as for an end in itself—worthy, irrespectively of any result, to be sought with unremitted assiduity. It therefore requires many a process to be gone through, the immediate or even the remote good of which the uninitiated may be wholly unable to discern. "Why"—such persons are wont to ask—"should my child study the mathematics, he is not to be an engineer?"—"why should the children of the poor be familiarized with works of the imagination, they are not designed to be poets?" What then? Has not your child a head to think? Have not the youthful poor hearts to feel—a character to be formed—a character which is their life, the source I mean of their chief good or ill? Bear in mind that we are discoursing of the education of man—of the training which a being ought to receive who is endowed with various capacities, and who cannot be in a state of entire health, who cannot enjoy the happiness of his nature, except *he*, and not a part of him, be educated—except all his faculties be subjected to a simultaneous and well-proportioned discipline.

Train the young to think justly, to feel correctly, to chasten their desires, to command their passions, to control their imagination, that they may enjoy the full happiness of which their nature is susceptible, and discharge the full measure of their duty to society. But if one state of the mind merits more attention than another, it is the thinking faculty, for our reason is the governing power. Its influence is paramount; it gives light, it purifies and regulates the affections, and it goes far to shape the life. It is of high consequence therefore that scholars should be trained to think. The modes for effecting this are various. The general discipline of the school should tend, excite, and foster the action of thought. Other things being the same, those studies and pursuits should receive the preference which tend most effectually to cultivate the thinking power. The culture of that faculty should ever stand as a primary object. Means for the purpose should be sought, studied, and reduced to practice. Whatever process goes forward, it should, by judicious questioning and careful explanation, be made to bear favourably on the opening and strengthening of the mind. Children should be encouraged to ask a reason of every thing, the signification of every word, an explanation of every difficulty. Do not damp but stimulate the principle of curiosity which, if only well directed, will even of itself effect very much for the information and development of the mind.

And for myself I cannot consent to acquiesce in any diversity of kind in respect of the education of the rich and the education of the poor. Nature has made no distinction in their several endowments, and I dare not admit any in their separate training. Circumstances indeed compel a difference in degree. For the child of the poor man we are obliged to be content with the discipline of the primary school, while the university receives the child of the rich after he has passed through his elementary studies. But it is our duty rather to diminish as far as we can even these differences of degree than to augment and vindicate them; nor can there be a surer sign of the progress of correct views on the subject of education, correct views of our social obligations, of what is due to man as such, and therefore to every human being, than in the degree in which these distinctions and differences are disallowed, and effectual measures are taken for giving the best possible, the widest and fullest possible, education to all classes of the community, and to individuals of both sexes. If it be true, as speaking in general terms it is, that there is no sex in souls, it is equally true that mental and moral capacity is wholly irrespective of riches and poverty and all the other diversities of the social scale. So let education be: as far as is possible, the training given in popular education should be not inferior in kind to the highest education in the country, nor should it be more dissimilar in degree than circumstances imperatively require.

But this leads me to another principle in popular education. It should have a relation to the future pursuits of life. We must regard not merely the faculties but the destination of an individual. One end, and not the least, of education is to prepare a child to fulfil the duties of the man. This is so obvious a duty that argument is not necessary to sustain the assertion of it. It is not only admitted but contended for even by those who do not value the higher discipline of the mind. Yet what have our elementary schools done for this purpose? What are they now doing? Absolutely nothing—nothing except the trivial preparation which may chance to ensue from the practice of reading and writing. First among the preparatory studies for future life I place morality. I say morality, I should have said religion, had not religion in this country been of so sectarian a nature, as to call up in the mind the idea of domination and rivalry, and heartburnings and dogmas. But the morality of the school will be—as indeed morality every where else—miserably defective if it be not founded on the great relations which man sustains with his Creator, and if it be not impregnated with the pious and benevolent spirit of the Saviour of the world. I would, indeed, labour most strenuously to keep away from our youthful poor the defilements of bigotry, but I must assert their right to have the basis of their character laid on the only solid foundation—Christian principle warmed and mellowed by Christian love. And certainly it is to be regretted that religion as such—and the ministers of religion in their proper character, cannot be welcomed in the discipline of our primary schools. We had, however, better make the sacrifice than have those schools the arena of low and conflicting passions, and permit them to lose in good and human and national feeling what they might probably gain in power. We may, however, make the sacrifice less, if only we are careful to enshrine in our schools the pure spirit of the gospel of Christ as found in the histories of the New Testament. And how can this be done? To no small extent by all those who exert an influence over them, and particularly the teachers, breathing themselves a spirit of general goodwill, of enlightened nationalism, of pure and spiritual benevolence;—if they are men and women who have a control over their own minds and hearts, and hence can bear and forbear, be peaceful amid disturbance, gentle under provocation, kind in expostulation, yet firm in punishment, strictly just, yet tempering justice with mercy, and in all their discipline mindful that in each heart entrusted to their keeping, there is to the child the most precious thing on earth, to its parents a source of comfort or discomfort, to society a blessing or a plague, a little world of feeling and impulse most delicate in its texture, most rich in its capabilities, hardening and become rigid, self-willed, masterful and selfish under severity and harshness, but budding and blossoming with the fairest flowers and fruit of human love, if only the kindly warmth of human affection be habitually applied. Here is the great secret of a good moral education—in this reduction of Christianity to practice—this embodying it in the life and shedding forth its choicest influences in the looks, words, actions and general bearing of those who do so much to give the school its moral tone. And I would even venture to say —so important is this influence, that without it, all set efforts at teaching morality will be of small avail and may possibly be subverted by the prevalence of an antichristian and an antihumane spirit.

I know not that I can choose a more suitable place than the present state of my remarks supplies for a few words on school discipline. It is obvious then that if this spirit of love is to be the predominating influence, the severities, the sometimes cruelties and injustice of the old practice of corporal punishments must be abolished. In speaking on this topic I may probably rouse the feelings of some that rank in a class of schoolmasters even now by no means small, who are such firm and implicit believers in the efficacy of whipping, that they hold no school can be conducted, no good scholar produced, without a due resort to corporal punishment. Force is their main if not their only instrument. The principle which lies at the base of their practice is that children dislike school, dislike study, heartily dislike them, and dislike the schoolmaster too; yet some knowledge must be got into them, therefore compulsion must be employed. The assumption is essentially vicious. It is not true—as a general fact—that children have the alleged dislikes. Some children may even hate the very sight of a book. But why? Because a book has been made hateful to them. Constraint, coercion, compulsion, force, violence, and injustice have been employed, and produced their natural consequences in the minds of the sufferers. Feelings of aversion of necessity spring up under such a discipline. The lower sentiments have alone been appealed to, and the corresponding reward is reaped in a distaste for learning which manifests itself in mental torpor, and in passive or active resistance to all the teacher's efforts. There is naturally not only no indisposition to knowledge in a child's mind, but on the contrary a curiosity, an eager and active desire for information which, if not repressed nor perverted, but rather fostered and gratified, will in most cases lead to the most desirable educational results. And wherever an inaptitude to and dislike of knowledge exists, we need look for no other cause than what is found in a mistaken discipline. We first create the evil and then plead its existence in justification of its continuance. How can we expect to find an ingenuous love of school and school pursuits if we convert the school into a prison, employ therein instruments of pain, and throw around all connected with it the most repulsive associations? When I consider the extent to which the appeal to force has been carried in schools, of what injustice they have been the scenes, how little, especially in common schools, the better feelings of our nature have been fostered, how little useful information, how little information of any kind, has been offered in them, I no longer wonder that there are many children who heartily dislike the very name, gain but little good and much evil, nor that the schoolmaster's office is felt to be a severe toil, if not a servile degradation. Some improvement has taken place. A better discipline is beginning to prevail—but it is not many years since practices were pursued which were no less degrading to the master than to his scholars. I can remember when in schools of a humbler character at least, flogging on the bare body was not unfrequent, and when what was termed *hoisting*—that is, caning one boy who was lifted and held on the back of another, was a daily custom. The infliction of stripes from the ferule on the palm of the hand still holds its place with no few, if not as an approved, yet as an expeditious method of vindicating authority or punishing neglect. But this is a very unpretending sort of severity compared with others. I still retain a vivid recollection of having had my hair almost plucked from my head and of having felt the nails of a teacher's hand almost meet through my ear; and to the present hour I cannot think of that teacher without emotions of pain, and a lively sense of the injustice I suffered at his hands. I have seen a master whose school comprised not fewer than 200 boys, all assembled, crowded I should have said, in one room, hurl from the elevation on which he sat, a piece of rope of a foot long and an inch in diameter, into different parts of the school, with a view to punish the negligent and exact attention. To his credit it should be said that he was not a bad marksman, yet not seldom the bolt of this petty Jupiter smote the innocent. The guilty however did not go free. If injustice was done, justice would have its due. The unfortunate culprit was required in all cases to take the rope to the master's desk, when he received a suitable number of stripes; and as if to remedy the mistake which was by times made of smiting the guiltless, the offender in such a case would have to undergo a double share of punishment. But even more exceptionable than this was another practice of the same sturdy disciplinarian. From the roof of the high school-room there was suspended a huge basket, which could be let down or raised by suitable tackling. In ordinary circumstances the basket was empty, and to an uninterested observer presented a sufficiently ludicrous appearance. Far different however was the view which the scholars took of this singular and novel mode of punishment, for few of them were there who had not been made to take their stand therein, after which it was elevated midway between the roof and the floor, where the unfortunate wight remained suspended for hours—sometimes an entire day—as if the object had been, by making him a spectacle and a sport to the school, to abolish every relic of modesty, shame, and sense of character in his bosom. The classical example of the satirist, *Aristophanes,* may indeed have been pleaded in justification, who in his play of the Clouds exhibited the virtuous Socrates—to use his own language—'basketed so high as to look down upon the Gods;' and certainly, if, as with the Athenian dramatist, the purpose were to load the sufferer with ridicule, scarcely a more effectual plan could have been adopted.

In serious earnestness however I must beg the advocates for corporal punishment to doubt their infallibility. The argument of blows has more force than efficacy. Bodily pains can do no more than exact a momentary obedience—to be followed by sturdy if not invincible opposition. They are an appeal to the lower passions, and rarely have any other effect than to make them more intense and more degraded, without calling forth any of the docile or virtuous feelings of the breast. Were our educators indeed persons who well understood the nature of the human mind with which they have to deal, and able in consequence to appreciate the precise effect of each particular influence they exert upon it, and were they at the same time persons who had a full control over their own impulses, so that they could pursue that line of conduct in each case which enlightened reason would dictate, I know not that I should recommend the entire supercession of bodily chastisement in the first instance, for there may be vices in a school which require signal punishment, and it is not always easy to pass at once from a system of severity to a system of gentleness. As it is however, I think that these cases had better receive even less effectual treatment than that a whole school should be hardened and made refractory by useless severities; I say useless severities, for I am fully persuaded that the infliction of corporal pain is, to speak in general terms, a useless severity. The order and efficiency of a school may not only be preserved without it, but preserved more easily and more effectually without than with it. And in regard to moral results there is no comparison between those which ensue from the employment of the cane, and those which ensue from the employment of reason and love. It must even at first sight appear a rough and inappropriate method of dealing with the mind and the heart to employ bodily severities. It looks like the act of one who either does not understand his business or will not give himself the trouble to practice it. The rod is the disgrace of school discipline. Nor in appearance merely—the tendency of such appliances is to harden, degrade, to keep the better sentiments inert when it does not overlay and destroy them, and to give baneful activity to the worst passions of our nature. Like all unnatural influences—like spirituous liquors—the use of bodily severity in one case necessitates its employment in another, and so onward only with increasing severity, till at last it becomes nearly and even wholly inoperative for good, but highly effective in perverting and depraving the character. In moral discipline it must be of the highest consequence to choose that which effects the good you desire without any attendant ill. Bodily severity fails in securing the good, and is prolific in ill. A temporary effect it may have in suppressing disobedience, but the more you condense the air, the more fearful the subsequent explosion: a momentary good will be repaid by large and lasting mischief. It should be borne prominently in mind that in regard to corrective discipline almost every thing depends on what I may term the moral pitch at which you commence. If it is low you must descend until your resources are exhausted; if you take a high pitch you will find the necessity for it gradually disappear. A blow eventuates in a flogging, and repeated floggings soon fail entirely of effect. A kind word, a gentle expostulation, an appeal to the higher nature, refines while it improves the character, and will at length enable you to effect by a look that for which all the force you could use in a whipped boy would be unavailing; and the tendency of such a system of firm mildness is to do away with the necessity of correction, and to permit the teacher to trust securely to the principle of obedience and the dictates of love deeply planted in the heart. I have myself seen tears drawn forth by a word of reproof in cases where a year or two previously the severest flogging would scarcely have extorted an outcry. One of the worst effects of the coercive system is the feeling of alienation between master and pupil, which is its invariable result. Hence ensues a relation of enmity. The boy looks on his teacher as his enemy, whose commands he feels repulsive and whose wrath he must evade. He therefore becomes disobedient, or obeys only so far as he is compelled, and accounts it a clever and praiseworthy thing to deceive and dupe his master. His fellow scholars identify their interests with that of the individual, and the whole community is arrayed against its head, and that in such a manner that, as with the ancient Spartans, detection is the only fault. Thus beset with secret enemies, the master, finding his plans traversed, his wishes and efforts either subverted or curtailed of their legitimate effect, grows suspicious, irritable and violent. By dint of main force he preserves a certain outward decorum, and calls his means discipline and his subjugation order, while, in reality, the evils exist which are inseparable from secret hostility, and cherished and applauded disobedience. There thus arises a school-morality which is repugnant in all its principles to the morality of ordinary life, and still more repugnant to the morality of the gospel, embracing on the one side concealment, deceit and cunning, and on the other watchful suspicion, distrust, compulsion and violence. Even the public mind is tainted and readily takes part with the disobedient boy in opposition to the harrassed, perhaps unjust teacher There may be caricature, but there is also truth in the representation which a powerful satirist of social misdemeanors has given, when he represents the heartiness with which a Yorkshire rustic signified his delight at the merited infliction with which Nickleby had visited the misshapen frame of Mr. Squeers. Did not at least a relic of these hostile feelings remain amongst us, it would be needless to affirm that as the relation between the teacher and the taught, ought to bear a close resemblance to that which exists between parent and child, so the only proper sentiments are kindness and confidence on the one side, and affection and confidence on the other. And until the discipline of our schools becomes truly parental, till teachers adequately feel their moral responsibilities, and feeling them, treat their charge with tenderness and forbearance, and until the pupils feel the weight of obligation under which they lie to competent, judicious, and kindly instructors, the moral influence of our schools must remain more or less detrimental, and lamentably fail of the great effects which it ought, and in favourable circumstances, would assuredly produce.

But important as is the influence of the moral habits which result from the indirect and unseen training of a wise benevolence, I would by no means rest satisfied with it. Principle is the only safe foundation of a virtuous and useful character, and principle apart from direct moral instruction cannot be said to exist. In every school therefore a course of systematic moral instruction ought to be given. I say advisedly systematic moral instruction, for I set little value by mere preceptive teaching in morals. ‘ Do this,’ ‘ do not do that,’ may suffice to prompt a momentary obedience, but can effect little beyond. Remove the pressure, the spring of disobedience will operate only the more powerfully, for the compulsory repose in which it had been. Eye-service is as short-lived as it is unpleasant. You must convince the judgment by appeals to the reason and win the heart by gently working on its better affections, if you would implant principle and beneficially influence the character. Your moral instructions must be grounded on a display of correct views of human relations, and especially of the relations which childhood and youth bear to God and man. Nor let it be supposed that such a mode of teaching will require the depth and dryness of philosophical disquisition. It is by no means a difficult task to lead even children to deduce for themselves correct conclusions respecting their moral relations and moral duties. The world to them is the little sphere in which they move, and so has their lot been ordered that out of their position in regard to their parents, their brothers and sisters, their friends and instructors, the food they eat, the clothing they wear, the heavens above them, the flowers, the birds, the feelings of their own bosoms and the feelings of those around them, they may be instructed to draw the moral light and impulse which they need. My readers will from this remark understand that I am not contemplating any abstractions nor even any wide generalizations in the moral teaching for which I ask. Indeed a greater mistake could not be made than to aim at any conclusions beyond those which lie within the interests of their own little world, and I consider it of indispensable necessity that the instructions given should have an immediate bearing on the faults to which they as children are liable, the temptations which they have to encounter, the duties which they have to discharge, and those other duties on which they are preparing immediately to enter. Nor let any one suppose that they will be insufficiently instructed if their minds are not carried forward at first to the relations and obligations of mature and declining years. If, as I require, the instruction be founded on principle, it will contain the germ of all future excellence, as the acorn envelopes the oak, and the surest guarantee, indeed the only trustworthy guarantee we can have, of a virtuous manhood, is found in the enlightened obedience of the child. He that has discharged the duties of the school and of his home—not from compulsion, nor passive imitation, nor blind habit, but from enlightened principle and well-regulated feelings, will not seriously fail in the duties of a husband or a citizen.

I have placed moral education first in the list of my requirements because I feel it to be of the first importance. It is so, since character is the first requisite, whether you consider the individual, the school or the family,—first I mean in point of time as well as of importance, for no sooner does reason expand than the child is an accountable being, begins to form his own happiness or misery, and to influence the moral condition of all with whom he comes into contact. It is so, for as character is so to say the moving power of the human being, every subsequent condition takes its complexion from it, and whether the child is to make progress in his studies, or to turn the knowledge and the power which he gains in the school, to a good or a bad account—good or bad for himself, his family, and eventually for society—all depends on the moral impressions which he receives. The materials with which you impregnate the fountain will follow the river to the termination of its course. And surely when we consider that a child is a moral being, that his character is his life, is the first, the last and the greatest influence under which he is, and by which he is to affect the world, we cannot consider it least among the mistakes of popular education, not only that for the most part the formation of character is utterly neglected, but that when it does receive attention, it is postponed to almost every other kind of discipline. In this transcendently important matter the last should be first and that which is least should become greatest. I know it will be thought, if not said, that the moral education of their children is the duty of their parents. I am of the same opinion. I will add that no one can discharge the sacred duty equally well. But this admission does not exonerate the schoolmaster. The influence of both is not too much, even when it is best in kind and greatest in degree.

Indeed I hold that where they possess the ability, the intellectual training of his own offspring is also first among a parent's duties. But how rarely is the ability possessed! And it is the want of this power which leads to the existence of the schoolmaster, who both in respect to the mind and the character of the child, stands towards him in the place of the parent. And if ability and opportunity are generally wanting on the part of the parent for the intellectual training of the young, how much more are the requisite moral qualifications? I do not intend to relieve the parent from the burden—to this point I shall in another paper address myself; at present it is enough to ask—is the duty discharged by the parent? If not,—and a glance into the houses of most of our working population will assure us that it is not discharged—that in actual circumstances it cannot be adequately discharged, then the sole point is, shall it be entirely neglected? If we tremble at the consequences of entire moral neglect of the young, then whose duty is it to conduct their moral education but that of the schoolmaster? where else can we look? The idea is not to be borne that their moral education should be cast on the parents when it is not executed, and then cast back on the schoolmaster who will not attempt it. We must treat this as a practical question, and then it will appear that the first requirement of a sound popular education is the judicious and systematic training of the character.

My purpose is rather to treat of principles than to enter into details; but there are one or two matters so important in their character as to demand some attention, while we consider the moral education of the youthful poor.

Manual labour schools have been recommended on the ground that as popular education respects those who have to gain their livelihood by the labour of their hands, it ought to comprise a training which should bear immediately on the interests and duties of the whole of their future lives. Institutions of this kind, however suitable for an agricultural, are by no means, I conceive, suitable for a manufacturing population. It might indeed be said that we have the thing without the name in the joint labour and instruction of the young which the factory system in its present state presents. I must however take leave to say, that this system has few features attractive to my mind. The instruction is too limited in time, and too wretched in kind,—the labour commences at too early an age, and is continued through too many hours, to meet with the approbation I would willingly bestow on any existing institution. And so early is bodily labour begun in the manufacturing districts, so severe is it in the effects which it produces on the frame, that I shrink, I must confess, from the introduction into popular schools of any mere manual pursuits. There is labour enough amongst us. In actual circumstances I am jealous of its intrusion into our schools.

"But," it is said, "you propose to educate the youthful poor in such a way that they will be above manual labour." It is enough to answer to such an objection, that the supposed pride would soon be corrected by the stern compulsions of necessity. Men must live, and to live they must work: whether they know little or much, the necessity remains the same. And if all were well educated, education, ceasing to be a distinction, would cease also to be a ground for undue self valuation.

Meanwhile let us ask—who have done most to foster this false and silly notion? Those who consider and have led others to consider bodily labour as disreputable. Much of the existing uneasiness in society, of that incessant and nervous effort to rise which so many, and not least the operatives, manifest; and much too of that alienation of feeling which makes the labourer disesteem the educated or the wealthy classes, arises, I have no doubt, from the very prejudices which too many of these classes have encouraged and do encourage in respect of the discreditableness of manual labour. Every sneer in which they indulge at the unwashed many; every instance in which they shun contact with the labourer; every haughty bearing with which they pass him in the street, tends to make him feel himself in a degraded situation, to make him restless, anxious for an elevation equal at least to that of those who now look down on him with a contemptuous, or at best with a compassionate or a patronizing air.

There is a way of levelling ranks without bringing on any social convulsion, and without interfering with any of the existing external inequalities. And of a levelling system of this nature I profess myself an ardent friend. It consists in the destruction of the prejudices to which I have just referred; in the setting aside and abolition of all false grounds for esteem and disesteem; in ridding the temple of the breast of its social idols, and leading men to think well of themselves and well of others only for those intrinsic qualities of the mind and heart, which find their appropriate exercise and gratification in the furtherance of the good as well of society as of the individual himself. Merit then would no longer depend on rank. In the scale of merit, indeed, rank and social position would disappear. Our imaginary social gradations would pass away, and in the prevalence of the feeling that neither social credit nor individual happiness depended on the place you held but on your character, the existing restlessness and morbid striving to rise would be done away, men would aim at the solid advantages of life, and our social inequalities, about which some manifest so much anxiety whenever the education of the people is under consideration, would be more secure, for the very reason that being less esteemed they would be also less nervously longed for and assailed, and less fearfully and tenaciously defended.

And the way to relieve society from these disturbing passions is to teach the young of the working population the simple facts that labour is honourable, and that happiness stands not in the rank but in the character. Let them be led to look to the pursuits of labour as no less creditable than any other honest pursuits whatever; to hold and feel that there is no personal or social disgrace but in idleness and dishonesty; that the position in which we discharge our duty to God, to man and to ourselves is nothing, the manner, the degree, every thing; nay that it is far more respectable, far more praiseworthy for the labourer to earn the subsistence of his family, how coarse soever it may be, by his own honest energies, than for the heir of thousands to squander the accumulations of his predecessors, or even to live on in a continued train of virtuous negations, doing no harm to any one, and as little positive good.

> "What merit to be dropp'd on fortune's hill?
> The honour is to mount it. You'd have done it;
> For you were trained to knowledge, industry,
> Frugality and honesty—the sinews
> That surest help the climber to the top
> And keep him there!"
> *Knowles's Hunchback,* Scene 1, Act 1.

With these correct views of human duty and social respectability in his mind, the youth would anticipate what the man would realize, namely, that honest industry is accompanied by as large a share of the happiness of existence as falls to the lot of any rank in society. I am not unaware of the advantages which affluence and ease might bring under certain circumstances, but I doubt if those circumstances have yet been developed in any degree so decided as to warrant an intense desire for the possession of property and station as such, and sure I am that not seldom a sudden or great elevation from one level of society to another is rather injurious than beneficial in its influence on the character and the happiness. Certainly the advantages which are so commonly the objects of desire and the causes of jealousy and social uneasiness, are more frequently appearances than realities. There is at least an approach to equality in the allotments of good which have been made to different classes in life. What is given in one way is taken in another; what is defective is made up by abundance. The toil of the labourer is compensated by the health, vigour, and comfort which it brings, and the treasures and luxuries of the rich are heavily taxed by the satiety, if not disease and deprivation to which they too often lead. And beyond a doubt all the real and lasting sources of happiness lie open to every one in every rank of life who possesses honourable sentiments, a good and kind heart, a love of independence, with a manly resolution to assert and maintain it. For their own good as well as for the good of society it is highly important that these moral truths should be impressed on the character of the young. This is a part of their training which cannot be dispensed with. Nor can the communication of any mere head knowledge compensate for its absence. It would be far better for them to be without the mechanical dexterity of reading and writing, than to be destitute of moral impressions, in which lie the very springs of their personal happiness. But there is no need that for the attainment of one good we should forego another; and I make the remark merely to show that in our anxiety to train the lips and the fingers while we have neglected the character—we have taken the less and left the greater good. There is however one sacrifice which must be made—one thing which must be surrendered, by those who would convey these important lessons to the young. They must themselves put away the vulgar estimates of wealth and position, and feel, and act as if they felt, the truths which they would communicate to their scholars. It will be of small service for those who instruct or those whose example immediately influence the inmates of our primary schools, to talk of the moral equality of all ranks. It must appear in their feelings, their casual remarks, in their language as well as in their conduct, that they really believe that respectability and happiness are independent of outward fortune, and are the unfailing rewards of industrious virtue, of the steady and judicious employment of our powers—of the wise and habitual improvement of the opportunities of our several stations.

I have dwelt at length on these topics, for in the training of the faculties of the young and the formation of their character, I recognise the primary duty of the good Educator, the essential requisites of a good popular Education. Give me only a well disciplined mind and a well regulated heart, and you have given the chief good which Education has to bestow and every thing of minor consequence will either follow or may without material injury be dispensed with. Withhold this—you occasion a loss which admits of no compensation, and whatever else you afford, it comes without a sure guarantee of proving beneficial. Knowledge is but an instrument, character is a result and an end. Knowledge gives power, but character insures happiness. Knowledge in union with a bad heart is power for evil, but the wisdom which is the offspring of a virtuous character is the parent of individual good and of social usefulness. And much as I conceive that knowledge tends to moral improvement, I can also imagine a state of mere intellectual cultivation which shall require you to support, scarcely less than you do now, a fearful apparatus of outward coercion—of police, judges, jails, banishment and death ;—but I hold it to be impossible that a virtuous peasantry, a population trained to think justly, to feel correctly, to act honourably should be otherwise than happy in itself, and the source of the nation's strength and prosperity, its bulwark, its best ornament and its pride.

J. R. B.

Art. V.—CHRISTIAN UNION: OR, CHURCHES WITHOUT DOGMATISM.

There are some who maintain not only the lawfulness, but the utility, of sectarian divisions of the Christian Church. Do they that say such things, remember the prayer of the dying Founder of our faith:—"*As thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they all may be one in us?*" Or the earnest entreaty of the magnanimous Paul:—"*I pray you brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you, but that ye all be perfectly joined together, in the same mind and in the same judgment?*" But in truth, where the tenor of the Gospel is so uniform and explicit as it is on this point, to cull testimonies is needless. And though we are told of certain advantages surmised to arise out of divisions, of increased exertions, more diligent researches, more energetic ministrations, the reply is obvious. Yea, assuredly, by the mercy of God, in all evil there is some good—and so it was of old. Some preached Christ out of contention and malice: yet, cried the generous apostle, "in every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is preached, and I therein do rejoice, yea and will rejoice." He trusted in that Providence which overrules all evil for good, but he praised not the divisions nor their authors. And so it is now. Whatever benefits may incidentally accrue from the schisms of the church, and some doubtless do so, though small in comparison with the evils flowing from the same source, still are those schisms not the less at variance with the spirit and precepts of the Gospel, nor the less to be deplored and condemned. We take here the high ground not only of the most unequivocal Scriptural testimonies, but of the generally prevailing sentiment of the church itself.

It is not, however, my intention to dwell longer at present on this hackneyed though important theme. The *sin of schism*, the evils of division, have long and largely been descanted on; nor has the drum ecclesiastic ever been beaten more lustily, than on this seemingly least polemic of all topics. Assuming that divisions are scandals, and remembering that though scandals must needs come, there is yet a curse denounced on those by whom they come, it will be better to direct our attention to the cause of these evils, and the means of their removal.

The cause—though doubtless there is more than one—but the great, the essential cause of Christian disunion, which deserves to be challenged, and confronted, and branded if possible with eternal infamy, is *dogmatism*.

Although the Scriptures, considered on the whole, and especially with respect to their religious instructions, could not without great injustice be charged with obscurity, but on the contrary must be admitted, both in regard to conception and expression, to be among the most simple and perspicuous writings, on their subjects, which have ever been produced; yet it must be confessed, that in particular passages, and especially in relation to incidental and unessential matters, considerable difficulties and ambiguities may not unfrequently be found in them. What else could reasonably be expected in a collection of writings so ancient, so extensive, so diversified in respect of authorship, matter, and style; and now at last, in these distant ages and countries, submitted to us through the medium of an often corrupted text, or erring translation? The swelling flood of time has long since overwhelmed and swept away both the actors and the deeds which those chronicles record; the lapse of ages has changed and abolished a thousand things with which their allusions were familiar; the very structure and usages of language itself are altered, and the glowing metaphors and bold hyperboles of the East, must be rendered into the cold and critical phraseology of modern Europe. Which things being so, is it any marvel, that the interpretation of the sacred volume should give occasion to variety of opinion? Nay, the wonder altogether is, that a book such as the Bible should on the whole be so plain and intelligible, even to unlearned and common minds, as we find it to be.

But though differences of opinion, in respect to the sense of Scripture, must always, to a greater or less extent, be expected to continue among Christians, yet be it observed that such differences do not in themselves either constitute dogmatism, or of necessity involve it. So long as we attribute to our own opinion no more than is its due, and willingly allow as much to the opposing opinions of others, so long we keep clear of dogmatism, and so long will mere difference of opinion be found a very bearable evil, if it be not even a source of some good. Friendly and candid minds, differing, but without dogmatism, while they stimulate each other's inquiries, will conciliate a mutual esteem. But when dogmatism enters all is changed. Forgetful that all men have alike both a right to think, and a liability to err, dogmatism desires to impose with authority its own opinions on others, and condemns with severity those who do not embrace them. It is an attempt at intellectual dictatorship, at tyranny of opinion. Blind and arrogant, it is ever confounding its own apprehension of truth with Truth itself, and exacting for the one that respect which is due only to the other. The dogmatist appears absolutely unconscious of his fallibility: he takes it for granted, amid many conflicting opinions, that his own are precisely right. This being assumed, he very naturally is disposed to undervalue and supersede the right of private judgment in others, and hence is ready to pass into the bigot and persecutor, to whom indeed he is near allied.

Dogmatism thus pourtrayed, appears no doubt absurd and odious. Nevertheless it is a melancholy truth, that from the Apostolic days to the present, the Church of Christ, under almost all its divisions, has been eminently characterized by the display of this principle. Here at least the orthodox and the heretic have agreed, and all sects seem to have been guided by a common rule. Almost universally they have sought to limit the exercise of private judgment by determining, on ecclesiastical authority, those disputed points of Christian doctrine, which, just because they are disputed, ought to be left free and open to the private judgment of their individual members. Almost universally has some theological peculiarity been adopted as the basis of religious communion, of which proceeding the disunion of the Church has been a necessary consequence.

But in condemning this practice of the Churches, as inconsistent with their union, we may encounter something like the following remonstrance,—Are you not advocating the doctrine of union in too great a latitude? Why do you disapprove in Christian Churches, that predefinition of principles and objects, which is allowed to be blameless, and indeed indispensable, in other human associations? It may be admitted that in the formation of institutions professedly for the purpose of the investigation and discovery of truth, such as are in general those of a philosophical nature, it is neither customary nor desirable to predetermine any questionable proposition. But there are other institutions of a different character, in which persons already convinced of the truth and importance of certain facts or opinions, combine for the purpose of declaring, vindicating, or diffusing them, or in some way carrying forward practical measures arising out of them. As being precisely of this latter description, may we regard those associations which we call Christian churches. Their professed object in general is not theological discussion, but religious worship and instruction, agreeably to the Christian religion; and it may consequently be very proper and useful for them, to predetermine, in some disputed matters, what that religion is.

Admitting this objection to be plausible, I must at the same time deny, that for its intended purpose, it is sound. It is asked why we disapprove of Christian churches predefining their principles and objects? The answer simply is, that we disapprove of no such thing. We do not blame Christian churches for predefining their principles, but for doing so in an improper manner and an undue measure, beyond what is necessary, useful, or lawful. We contend that *the principles requisite for Christian communion are already sufficiently defined in the Scripture, and that to attempt to set up any other standard is superfluous and unjustifiable.*

Assuredly Christian churches are not to be viewed in the light of philosophical societies, whose object is investigation and inquiry. That work, as regards their principal purposes, they must regard as already done: they are the offspring of convictions already formed, and their members meet to fulfil practical duties arising out of these convictions; to perform divine worship, and promote each other's spiritual improvement by exhortations and instructions. However important the full and free investigation of the first principles of religious truth may be, they feel that as a matter of speculative inquiry, it belongs to other times and places. Even were they not Christians, but worshippers on the grounds of natural religion only, still some common principles even then, such as those of the being of God and the propriety of public worship, all must suppose them to have assumed. But as Christians they must needs go further, and feel obliged, by the very nature of their faith, to worship God in the name of Christ, and by the rule of his Gospel. They must assume, as the very basis of their communion, *a common reception of Christianity as taught in scripture.* We allow then to the objector that a predefinition of principle by Christian churches to this extent is right, but contend that it is inadmissible any further.

But here the reader will perceive that we are brought, in effect, to the old question respecting the use of creeds and articles of faith. To enter, however, on this controversy as far as it regards formal impositions, would not only be inconsistent with the proper limits of this paper, but would be beside my purpose, because I wish to suppose myself addressing those among whom the practice of prescribing extra-scriptural creeds has already been abandoned and condemned. Those who wish to study this question should not omit to read the able and pleasant tract of Paley on *Subscription to Articles of Faith:* only while so engaged, let them forget for the moment, that that shrewd churchman showed himself afterwards too worldly wise to join his clerical brethren in the petition for a removal of those impositions. He pleaded poverty, it is said, and that "he could not afford to keep a conscience."

We have more properly to do at present with the inconsistency which, while it admits and even zealously maintains the principle which this clever divine defended indeed anonymously, but declined openly to contend for, allows nevertheless the continuance of practices by which this principle is in reality denied and subverted. Ecclesiastical dogmatism may dispense with the formalities of creeds and subscriptions, and yet find means of effecting its purpose. That purpose is the erection in the church of some extra-scriptural standard of faith; and if this, in effect, be accomplished, the particular process by which it is done is a matter of secondary importance.

The imposition of creeds and articles, and other set tests of opinion, does this with a high hand, and a bold front. This is an open unblushing tyranny, which seeks no disguise for its usurpations. But how many degrees are there not between this domineering insolence, this outrageous aggression, and that thorough-going liberality of mind, which cordially respects the freedom of another's thought, and instinctively loathes even the wish to infringe on it: which would not value at a straw even opinions the most correct, and most agreeable to its own, unless assured that they were formed in freedom, and uttered with sincerity.

The church that would really be guiltless of the charge of dogmatism, must be guided, in all its proceedings, by a truly comprehensive and catholic spirit. It must consistently bear in mind, *that its Christianity is written only in the Scripture, and that as a church, it has in no sense adopted or recognized any sectarian interpretation.* It must, therefore, in good faith, respect in this matter the private judgment of its several members, and as far as possible allow nothing that tends to scandalize and exclude any scriptural Christian. Its devotional services should be rational, simple, and indisputably scriptural; avoiding as far as possible, all controverted points, so that in these the whole church may be able, with one mind, one mouth, to glorify God. And although the discourses of the pulpit, in which the minister no longer addresses himself in the name of the congregation to God, but addresses the congregation itself in his own name, neither need nor ought to be subjected to so close a restriction, still we must feel that the style should be that of one who remembers that on all debateable ground, he utters the views of an individual only, and not of necessity those of the church. The church should also be jealously careful, to do nothing which, either avowedly or impliedly, goes to profess a Sectarian faith. Especially therefore, *should it scrupulously forbear to designate itself by any of those terms which have been used to indicate theo-*

logical distinctions. For surely it is evident, that the use of such titles not only breathes a dogmatical and sectarian spirit, but is actually equivalent to the formal adoption of an extra-scriptural creed.

The spirit of dogmatism, as before intimated, has its source in an undue estimate of the importance of the points on which Christians differ. To strike at its root, we should establish ourselves in the assurance that the Scripture itself, aided by a fair exercise of reason, is clear enough, on all essential points, to carry conviction to an honest mind. Having, therefore, endeavoured to secure the free and unprejudiced use of reason and scripture, the church should be satisfied that it has done all which to any good purpose need, or can be done, toward securing rectitude and uniformity of opinion. In this assurance it should firmly rest, and allow no petty jealousy, no impatient irritability, to disturb its repose. It has taken that position in which it is entitled to anticipate in its own case the fulfilment of the maxim: *Magna est veritas et prævalebit.* Does not the Scripture clearly, explicitly, and repeatedly, inculcate all the essential truths of our religion; all that it concerns our salvation for us to know? Surely no one can deny this, without feeling that he casts on the Holy Book a very severe reflexion. But doctrines so taught will not be much misapprehended by honest minds. Although, therefore, differences of opinion on various points must always be expected to arise, still it is to be presumed that they will not be such as to affect the essence of Christianity, or such as need hinder communion, or disturb peace. Wrong-headed individuals may no doubt be found, whom no clearness of instruction can preserve from eccentricity, but of the great majority of every congregation, what has been said will assuredly hold good. Abandoned thus to private opinion, and no longer forced into artificial importance by bigoted denunciation or exclusive intolerance, the disputed tenets of theology will shrink into comparative unimportance, and retire into the shade: and controversies on whose issue neither emolument nor exclusion, neither spiritual partisanship nor *odium theologicum*, any longer depends, may be conducted with perfect good humour, and even with edification. Thus the clamour of these doughty contests will cease, "*and leave us leisure to be good.*"

In almost every dispute respecting scriptural doctrine, one thing may be observed, namely, that the controversy will be found to be little else than a logomachy, a strife about words, to which the contending parties have not been at the pains to attach any very clear or precise conceptions. In such cases, if the antagonists will respectively consent to waive that unscriptural phraseology for which they so warmly, but uselessly contend, and to substitute in its stead the language of the sacred authors themselves, they will find the question in dispute speedily assuming a less formidable aspect: perhaps they will soon even begin to wonder what is become of it. Adopting the language of the sacred writers, they also insensibly and unavoidably will fall into their way of thinking. They will thus be led to form ideas which very probably will not precisely correspond with those previously entertained by either of the disputants; these new ideas will be a sort of neutral ground, a something which neither party intended to attack, in which therefore both can agree, and which will seem to solve the controversy as by a magic key. Or even if the issue be not quite so happy as this, the parties will at least be convinced that they substantially agree much more nearly than they were before aware of, and that what remains in dispute is not of very vast importance.

As an illustration of what is here advanced, let us briefly glance at that *vexatissima quæstio,* that most redoubtable of all theological debates, respecting the Deity of Christ. One party maintains as a Scriptural doctrine that Christ was God, another regards this same position as plainly opposed to Scripture. Here then, at least, one might say, there is a broad and weighty question at issue. Yet I believe as a fact, that candid and scriptural Christians of nominally opposite views, rarely discuss this question without being brought under an impression that their real difference of opinion is something which they would be rather at a loss to define.

As far as regards the application to Christ of the *name of God,* the facts of the case are pretty simple. There is not in the New Testament a single certain and admitted instance of such application, though, unquestionably, there are several passages in which it appears to be the more obvious construction. Yet if it be considered how few, as well as equivocal, these passages are, and especially when compared with the numberless occasions on which this title might have been employed, had such been the apostolic usage, the conclusion is almost inevitable, that the point is really so disputable that in candour and reason, it ought neither to be absolutely denied by the one party, nor positively insisted on by the other. In the mean time, there are some recorded words of Christ himself which are sufficient to show, that at any rate, this title *might* have been assigned him at once without impropriety, and without implying any disputed point of theology. When the Jews accused him of making himself God, because he had called God his Father, Jesus replied; "Is it not written in your law, 'I said, ye are Gods?' If it called them Gods to whom the word of God came, say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, thou blasphemest, because I said I am *the Son of God?*"

Now if we turn from the question respecting the name to the consideration of the doctrine itself, and inquire what it is which the asserter of the deity of Jesus understands by that phrase, beyond what is equally allowed by his opponent, we shall find in the great majority of cases, that this is something very subtle and unsubstantial, if not absolutely inexplicable. For how is it? Of the true and perfect *humanity* of Jesus, both in body and soul, we find a general admission: moreover, his high and peculiar spiritual union with the Deity, being a fact unequivocally announced in Scripture, is also undisputed. It is only in the attempt to define more precisely the extent or nature of this union, that amidst a felt inability to comprehend the incomprehensible, a painful and bewildering effort of the human faculties to do what is naturally beyond their power, theologic differences begin. Yet even here there is much in common. It is agreed that the humanity remained perfect, that the Deity was unchanged: that the former retained its distinct consciousness and will, its partial ignorance, its liability to temptation, and all its other innocent infirmities; the latter, the undiminished exercise of all its infinite perfections. Whatever therefore the union were, it was, by common consent, such as was compatible with these conditions. Considering then, on the one hand, in how intimate a sense the Deity, in whom we live and move and are, is in union with us all; and on the other, the limitations under which the universal church has necessarily apprehended his special union with Jesus, it will probably be allowed that the utmost possible range for rational difference of opinion in this matter is not very wide. It will also probably be felt, that the words in which the sacred authors have expressed their own conceptions on this subject, are at least as well fitted for that purpose as the most elaborate creeds and confessions that have been invented since. "*The word became flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld its glory.*" "*The words that I speak to you, I speak not of myself; the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works.*" "*I and my Father are one.*" All this way Scriptural Christians may travel on in harmony. But now, if unsatisfied with a simply scriptural expression of their faith, they proceed to insist on their logical dogmas, the career of strife and schism will begin.

Having made these general reflections on the nature and evils of the dogmatic principle, as operating in Christian churches, I proceed to notice in this respect the conduct of some existing parties.

And in the first place let us glance at the Church, (so called,) of England, the national establishment of this country. She professes an apostolical faith and discipline, and her apologists go so far as to boast of her liberality, and tolerance, and catholic spirit. Yet it must by the impartial be confessed, that this Church is entrenched within ramparts embattled by dogmatism and bristling with anathemas, denouncing exclusion and perdition on all who hesitate to pass over the wire-drawn bridge of her exquisitely subtle creed, and enter her frowning fortress by the narrow gate of her thrice-revised orthodoxy. The polemic divines of this church look around from her towers, and beholding the wandering flocks of Christians on the plain below, thunder against them denunciations of heresy and schism, because they prefer their freedom to the discipline of the garrison. They must be told, that by their own exclusive regulations, they are themselves the authors of that severance which they so bitterly indeed denounce, but which we shall then believe them sincerely to deplore, when we see them endeavour to relieve even one of the conscientious scruples by which it is produced. Till then, let the Church of England bear other titles than Catholic and Apostolic, and rather be called, as indeed she is, the stronghold of dogmatism in this land.

Of Protestant Dissenters two classes alone appear to have regarded the absence of dogmatism as a thing to be aimed at, or boasted of; namely, the *Quakers* or Friends, and the *English Presbyterians,* now often spoken of as Unitarians.

With respect to the former, it may be observed that by their primary principle of immediate revelation, and their ever laudable zeal for religious liberty, they have hitherto been preserved from the adoption of a set creed, or dogmatical designation; and I believe that it may also be said with truth, that there has commonly prevailed among them a fair share of substantial liberality and latitude, in respect of doctrinal matters. Yet one cannot but observe with regret that the English Quakers of our day seem inclined rather to excuse than to emulate the high-mindedness of their ancestors, and to be infected in no small measure by the conceited fervour of that *pseudo-evangelical* religionism which prevails every where around them. May they take warning in time, and not be ready to sacrifice the noble distinction of being preeminently *practical Christians,* to which they have hitherto had so just a claim, through anxiety about maintaining the poor and vulgar reputation of orthodoxy.

The English Presbyterians, during the course of the last century, were led to adopt very cordially and fully the *adogmatous* principle. They disclaimed synodical control, laid aside the

Assembly's Catechism, abandoned the technical language of theology, set reason above authority, and asserted an unlimited freedom of private judgment in the interpretation of Scripture. This license of inquiry was soon followed, if it was not partly caused, by considerable changes in theological opinion, and among other less notable dogmas, that of the Trinity, with certain inseparable satellites, continually more and more undermined by the encroachments of reason, at length crumbled to pieces and was swept away. Then for a while Arianism prevailed, but this was only in a state of transition, and the result has been that nearly the whole of the churches in question have gradually embraced that scheme of doctrine which is commonly called Unitarian. Such has in this instance been the result of *adogmatism.*

And now arises an interesting question. Do these churches continue to maintain unimpaired that wise and liberal principle from which their present, and as they believe more enlightened views have sprung? Or do the inheritors of religious liberty, forgetful of their descent, begin to *dogmatize* anew? Would that this question could receive an answer entirely satisfactory! But in fact, though these churches have with few exceptions avoided the use of settled formulas of faith, yet they have not in some other points acted so consistently with their avowed principles.

Very generally the churches in question may be considered, as more or less formally, professing *Unitarianism.* Their members are accustomed so to speak of them: the public so regards them: their ministers recognize this designation, even in the pulpit: both themselves and their congregations become subscribers to societies enrolled under this name: in public notices their place of worship will be styled *the Unitarian Chapel.* Now to many most worthy persons all this appears not only quite unobjectionable, but actually commendable. They would say that they think it right for a congregation plainly and openly to avow its real sentiments. Assuredly it is so. Let every thing always, but in religion especially, be done in the most open and honest manner.. But our point has been, not that a church should dissemble its sentiments, but that in regard to disputed tenets of theology, it ought not to regard itself, *in its collective capacity,* as *having* any sentiments; and that if it ought to have none, of course it ought to profess none. On this point, in general, our case is closed, and must not now be reopened. To those who go with us on this general issue, we submit that the prevalent practice on the part of congregations professing Unitarianism, and adopting that designation, is a violation of the principle which it goes to establish. Some, however, will demur to the minor of our syllogism. Admitting our first proposition, that churches ought not to dogmatize, they will suggest that in the profession of Unitarianism there is no dogmatism, and therefore that our condemnatory conclusion fails. The term *Unitarian,* they will say, implies no more than one who believes in the strict and proper unity of God, a doctrine confessedly scriptural, and universally admitted. In professing this, there is nothing dogmatical or sectarian. But the fact here asserted is surely not correct. The term Unitarian, understood only in that general sense above explained, would be perfectly unmeaning and impertinent, if adopted as the designation of a party. So adopted, it has no rational meaning, unless it be taken as antagonistic of the doctrine of the Trinity, that is, as implying a belief that the Deity exists *in one person,* in a sense corresponding to that in which the Trinitarian maintains that he exists in *three.* Now the term *person,* on which this controversy hinges, we all know to be one which most exquisitely belongs to technical theology. Let not a common English layman suppose that he knows any thing about its sense in divinity; nay, let not the religionists who dispute about it by the hour, be too hasty in assuming that they know what it means. Let them first consider that it is merely a Latin or English representative of the Greek term *hypostasis,* which is that employed in the original creeds. The English word most nearly equivalent to this Greek term, probably is *subsistence.* The question at issue may therefore be thus stated: whether in the Deity, there be three *subsistences* or only one. It is a capital point of orthodoxy that there is in the Deity but one substance, or essence: in that all agree: but there remains this debate, whether there be one or three *subsistences.* *Unitarianism* consists in maintaining that there is but *one.* We see, therefore, not only that the designation of *Unitarian* does relate to a point of dogmatic theology, but likewise how perspicuous, and intelligible, and important a point that is! How worthy to be made the Shibboleth for which a party professing, *κατ᾽ ἐξοχὴν,* to be liberal and enlightened, shall contend! And here I leave my argument, feeling myself warranted in concluding and maintaining, that all churches acting in the manner above described, depart from sound principles, violate Christian duty, betray religious liberty, have already lapsed into dogmatism, and are in the road to darkness and bigotry.

The practical conclusion is this, and it ought to be distinctly stated. The use of the term Unitarian, along with every other which goes to express dogmatical peculiarities, ought to be totally disused by all congregations, nor ought they in any other way to allow themselves to become pledged to any sectarian creed. They should think it enough to be Christians, and treat minor distinctions with contempt. Is it not enough to be the *Christian Church assembling* so and so? If

> A Christian is the highest style of man,

the same is also true of a church. On all common occasions no other style can be wanted, but if some should occur on which something of the distinguishing principle requires to be expressed, it may best be done in a phrase not drawn from dogmatism, but its absence; such as,

ANTI-DOGMATIST.

ON CHRIST.

TRANSLATED FROM TIEDGE.

Firmly my faith I rest on thee,
Howe'er these zealots may to me
The beauty of thy being mar;
Who, from thyself removed as far
As earth from heaven, with frauds combine
To cheat men of that gift divine,
Which, bright and pure and breathing heaven,
Forth from thy god-like soul was given.
  Thy work (whatever priests may do,
Who hostile yet thy steps pursue)
Shall still endure, thou man of light!
Thy word is light; thy deeds so true
Are stars which never sink in night.
  Simplicity and love thou chose
Thy lofty lessons to disclose,—
Around thee hung no mystery;
Thou man of light, I rest on thee!

But couldst thou, on this side the grave,
A pilgrim, walk through life once more,
And see this wild and fierce uproar—
How every truth, thy wisdom gave,
Is tortured both by fool and knave;
How, with unfeeling hearts, they bring
Thy thoughts of love to serve their turn;
And persecuting precepts wring
From laws, which bid us tolerance learn,
And o'er each fault forgiveness fling,

And blessing still for hate return;
How keen they grind the blade of strife;
And, in bold arrogance of life,
That lowly meekness spurn away,
Which made thee reverently say,
'Why call me good, there is not one
Is truly good, save God alone;'—
Ah! couldst thou but look forth and see
How round thy form of tranquil light
They weave thick clouds of mystery;
And (leagued with that ensecret might
Which only safe in gloom can be)
Employ with zeal each treacherous way
To rob us of the mental day,
Which thou would'st open on our sight;
How, in the dark and deep midnight
Of error, proudly gathering still,
With tyrant power, and fraudful skill,
They strive to silence every mind,
Which over-wise for them they find;
How they the juggler's tricks repeat,
And scruple not the bold deceit,
Again that search for signs to raise,
Condemned by thee in former days;
And how, instead of following thee
And seeking what thou wast, to be—
A man, who life's rough pathway trod,
Full of the spirit of our God—
They labour merely to define
What nature might on earth be thine;
And how, while robed in mildest show,
With murderous tongues they are not slow,
But, in thy name, continual still
The law of sacrifice fulfil;—
Ah! if thine eye but these things saw,
How wouldst thou straight thy look withdraw!
But shouldst thou seek, with gentle speech,
Once more thy mind and will to teach,
Right soon thou'dst find that these they knew
Far better than thyself could'st do.
How should *they* hearken to thy word,
Whose inmost souls with fear are stirred
Whene'er the wise begin to plead,
And only to themselves give heed?
Nay, should'st thou not their creed receive,
And of thyself just so believe
As they infallibly ordain—
They'd nail thee to the cross again!

W. G.

Art. VI.—DR. TUCKERMAN.

Perhaps the highest marks of true Greatness are to be found in the force and reality with which a mind identifies itself with the moral feelings and obligations, the sentiments and duties, of universal Brotherhood, that arise naturally out of our human relationships. Surely he is most a Man, whose sympathy with man, whose respect for man, is the deepest, the widest, the most unfailing; and he is the greatest of men in whose heart and life there is the intensest spirit of *humanity*. Nor is this a Greatness which, in the higher forms of it, is at all common. Men do not sympathize most quickly and most strongly with the purely *human* interests of this world. The bonds that hold them most forcibly and most surely are not, for the most part, the simple claims of humanity. The sounds that are surest to catch their ears, and to divert them from all other voices, are not the pleadings of human beings, in their various sufferings and necessities, seeking sympathy and aid. If a call upon the sentiments of human interest and human mercy were to cross and to interfere with some of the objects which men seek in Life, it would be no common Greatness and Rectitude of nature that would at all times be most powerfully attracted by the human voice, and that would arrest the most eager steps of worldly pursuit, to turn aside and satisfy the *human* claim.

We do not mean to pass any censure upon our nature, by declaring that this true Greatness, which identifies itself with human claims and sympathies, in preference to all other interests, is rarely to be found. Wherever great virtues, the higher forms of feeling and character seldom appear, it is not owing solely to the depravity of the will; in all such cases there are difficulties, not merely of manifest selfishness and temptation, but of education, of prejudice, of habit, of all that we call second nature, which are absolutely insurmountable, except to a mind which re-examines all its principles of conduct in the purest light of the soul, and that under the guidance of truth alone, undisturbed by self interest and passion, endeavours to make for itself, and to clothe with supreme authority, spiritual estimates of existence. Now simple, and natural, and with necessary roots in our very hearts, as the sentiment of humanity may appear, there is none which it is more difficult to form,—none which it is more difficult to be faithful to, in feeling and in conduct,—to preserve in a condition of purity against the blinds of circumstance, and to invest with a simple and genuine power, as the practical and determining principle at once of our affections and our life. The spirit of society, the inveterate influence of manners, the still existing traces of barbarous institutions, the very character of our civilization, and the poorest and lowest and most easily excited passions of our nature, all seem banded together to destroy in us this primitive sentiment of human equality and of human brotherhood, and the practical spirit of union and love that flows out of it. We are not surprised, with such a force of Custom and Temptation concealing and weighing down the simply spiritual estimates of our social relationships, that a heart thoroughly *human*, bound to the interests of man, and obedient to his calls, as it is to no other attractions, is the very rarest form of Truth and Greatness.

We must, indeed, in some degree, rise to God's view of human nature and of human life, before we can thus identify ourselves with Mankind, and find in its service our truest happiness. Jesus Christ felt this spirit of humanity to be the divinest mark and gift of the inspiration of the Father of all spirits; intense and universal sympathy with man was in his mind the most intimate union with God, to participate, if we may so express it, in God's sympathies, and to look upon human life, and upon human nature from God's point of view. "The spirit of the Lord is upon me, *because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor.*" This is the spiritual revelation of Christianity, — this, its rectification of all the poor and false estimates that man makes of those things wherein his true life consists,—to make us feel that our human nature is the whole of our inheritance from God, the soil from which we must raise the fruits on which we are to live,—that we are all, in these universal and eternal lights, children of the same Father, partakers in the same springs and fountain head of blessings, and with nothing to separate us from each other but souls that are not souls, that look, not spiritually, but with eyes of flesh and sense, on what we are, and what we possess, and whither we are tending.

Every man who in simplicity and faithfulness, without affectation and in truth of heart, realizes this spirit of humanity, becomes, in his own person and character, a new revelation of Christianity. Jesus Christ speaks through that man; and speaks not through the dead letter, but places before us the living word of God. As it was the Saviour's highest greatness that he revealed and displayed this sentiment, so it is the highest greatness of his followers that they are the Apostles of this Spirit, that they give it a living form and voice, that they become saviours to the unspiritual world, through the force and energy with which, embodying it themselves, they send it on the breath of life into the hearts of others. The man who in our times realized most fully this Christian sentiment, this spirit of humanity,—the man of whom multitudes acknowledged that he approximated them to the presence of Christ,—that he spoke of the Christian feeling of man to man with a freshness, a reality, that went to the convictions and to the soul,—and who, into whatever land he came, could make it felt that in tender and respectful sympathy with his Race, and with every member of it, he was distinguished from other men, and more genuinely Christian than the rest of the world, must be regarded as a partaker, in the highest kind of Greatness,—eminent above others in the very way that excellence is most difficult to achieve, by the superior force and simplicity of sentiments that are yet common to all,—and a representative of practical Christianity, which coming to us in a living shape, we ought gratefully to receive and study as a new light and gift from God. Dr. Joseph Tuckerman has spent his life in his Master's service. We have received all from him, that God has permitted him to do in this world. We have many men left to us who are able, more able perhaps than he was, to give us grand and original views of religion, of God, and of the soul,—but I know not that we have one who is capable of making a new revelation of Christianity, by exhibiting it in fresh forms of life and application. To him was it given by his heavenly Father, not to throw new light, or contested doctrines, or to be a victor in the war of words, but to do something to restore to the world the faded image of our Saviour,—to help men to conceive the soul of sympathy with which Jesus looked upon his brother man, and the tones of equality and love in which he claimed a brother's right to rescue and bless him,—to bring back again to the earth some faint resemblance of that first and mightiest exhibition of our Religion when, "not in word but in power," it identified itself with all who were in need, and showed that the Spirit of the Lord was upon it, by the energy with which it re-created that spirit within the souls of others, and on the simple breath of sympathy gave out life from itself.

It is not our intention to speak the praises, or to fix the place of Dr. Tuckerman. We are not even sure whether the kind of greatness we attribute to him would altogether satisfy the most ardent of his admirers,—and whether they might not claim for him other qualities of mind which confer distinction of an entirely different character. We place no class of excellence in the same rank, or deem it at all comparable with that which we accord to him,—and our sympathy with it is the greater that in order to be a partaker in it no rare gifts of intellect are required, that it is a greatness which instead of separating unites men together, for all can understand it and feel that they themselves might be sharers in it; a greatness for which we may prepare ourselves by cultivating a right heart, an unworldly will,—accessible to all who have a sound moral nature, simple affections, and some generosity of life.

Neither do we at all presume that we entirely understand his character, and are capable of doing him justice. To analyze the mind of another, to attempt to unfold his inmost nature and being, to enter the secret chambers of thought with the view of bringing forth into the light all that they contained, and making manifest the springs of life and action,—is what we would not presume to do for the least gifted spirit in the world, even if the amplest opportunities of knowledge were afforded to us, much less for one, of whom to speak thus familiarly and to pretend to such a comprehension, would be in fact to violate the very sentiment of reverence with which he has inspired us. We would only contemplate his spirit and proceedings for our own benefit, and with no thought of doing justice to him, seek for ourselves something more of his Christian simplicity, truthfulness, and force.

We have intimated what we consider the distinguishing excellence of Dr. Tuckerman, the characteristic of such greatness as he had, and the source of whatever influence he exerted, of whatever good he accomplished. It was simply the entireness, the genuineness with which he realized the practical sentiment of Christian relationship in regard to all classes of men. The form which in him this sentiment assumed, this sense of brotherhood with, to use a favourite expression of his own, the poor and the poorest, the low and the lowest, naturally took its shape from the direction of his own professional life, from that department of human service in which he was accustomed to labour. There is no necessity that the spirit of humanity should take the form of a Ministry to the Poor.—It may with equal propriety take the direction of any other department of services and sympathies which the qualifications and habits of the individual who feels it, enable him to bestow, but there was a moral fitness in a Minister of the Gospel, manifesting his fuller and intenser spirit of humanity by preaching the Gospel to the poor, by dispensing to the lowest and most destitute, when he first felt himself bound to them as a brother, the very same gifts and consolations which he had previously dispensed to the highest, and most favoured.

In connection with the universal administration of religious influences, to which his own thoughts and life were devoted, Dr. Tuckerman, as appears both from his writings and character, realised with peculiar force some sentiments which to any mind truly imbued with the feeling of human equality, of God's equal love for all, must be immediately obvious, —but which yet (if the absence of their practical recognition by society is any proof of the absence of the Christian sentiment of humanity from which they spring) by the poor and scanty life we give to them, lamentably betray the feebleness with which we all apprehend the most familiar truths, the very fountain principles of obligation and duty. The most remarkable of these Christian feelings, which by the peculiar earnestness with which he experienced and applied them, he made as it were his own, we shall briefly state.

I. To any one really penetrated with the Christian spirit, with Christ's views of man, it would seem a simple thing to say, that they who had the most need, had also the most claims,—that the first in destitution should be the first to awaken sympathy. The courtesies and gifts which worldly men bestow upon worldly men who do not need them, when compared with the little they do for those to whom this lavished superfluity would make all the difference between happiness and misery, perhaps between life and death, have become a proverb,—but within the bosom of Christianity, in the heart of the Christian Church, with all who adopt the sentiment of Brotherhood, as the spring of their human offices and duties, that this simple principle should ever conceal itself,—that the most destitute should be the first cared for and relieved, that the Physician should be principally with the sick and with the diseased, should be a practical obligation that could ever be forgotten or obscured, or require to be proved and insisted on, would seem a matter not to be contemplated. Yet in the very constitution of our Christian Churches, in the very heart of that portion of society which is especially religious, this Christian sentiment has not only been forgotten but practically reversed,—those most destitute of all that makes men spiritual and gives dignity of life have been left without light from above,—and those whom God has most favoured and blessed, who, surrounded most abundantly with other sources of knowledge, and religion, and virtue, could best do without Sabbaths, and Preachers, and Churches, have provided these things for themselves, and instead of preaching the Gospel to the poor have abandoned them to their spiritual poverty. Until very lately this was the uniform spectacle afforded by the Christian world, at least in the constitution of our Churches. The educated, the cultivated, those who were within the influences and restraints of Society, those who were capable in a great measure of supplying all Christian instruction for themselves, these alone Christianity approached, addressed, intreated. The ignorant, the exposed, the vicious, upon whom the spirit of society exercised no direct influence of an elevating kind,—to these no Christian voice penetrated,—Christianity entered into no direct communication with them; they were the sinners, but it came not to call them to repentance,—they were the sick, but it brought them no physician. Can we wonder that Christianity has done so little to preserve the purity and moral soundness of large communities, when the most exposed have been the most uncared for, when those in the greatest peril have been those most without supports and aids,—and when even those who sought Christianity for themselves had yet so little of its spirit, understood it so little, and felt it so little, that they left their brethren without it? We have Churches framed by the State, administrations of Christianity appointed not for individuals, but for national purposes, to carry religious instruction to the people, that yet have so little of the spirit of a Christian operation, that they seek no access to those who are most in need of the influences they could give, and they confine their ministrations to those who in some respects are already graced by religion, knowledge, virtue, and the influences of civilization. Surely, until it was pointed out, it would seem a thing incredible, that Religion for an indefinite period should be addressing the instructed classes, and leaving the uninstructed to all the exposures and temptations of their lot, without a shelter and without a word. Upon this anomaly, this absence of spiritual sympathy and brotherly interest in the very heart of Christian Churches, Dr. Tuckerman was the first to fix attention. Previous efforts doubtless there had been, by city missions, and by the employment of inferior instruments, but never the proposal of a Ministry for the Poor, on the same generous principles, and of the same efficacy and qualification, that the rich and the favoured would seek for themselves. To awaken in Christian men a sense of their obligations to the poor,—to make them feel that God's call is loudest in those directions where instruction, aid, shelter, would work the greatest change, and confer the richest blessing,—to revive in this respect the spirit of the original Gospel,—this was his mission in the world. A nobler none can have. It was that of the Son of God himself.

To awaken the feeling of responsibility in this matter, we give a single extract from his writings:—

"The Ministry at Large, as I should be glad to have it constituted, should be brought into the closest connection that can be formed of it with our churches. It should be virtually an extended ministry of these churches. It should be supported by, and taken into the bosom of these churches. Yet not as an inferior ministry, or as a mere charity;

but as a constituent, essential, and altogether equal and important member of the body. I would have the demand for it come forth from the churches in the clear, strong, and unequivocal language of Christian sympathy, interest, and love; and the instruments required for it should be men not only of great purity, and piety, and singleness of purpose, and not only men embued with the spirit of humanity, and full of zeal for the cause of Christ, but men who, before their election to the work shall be confirmed, shall have proved themselves to be the workmen demanded for the service. I would have it an object of this ministry, to encourage and aid all those whom it shall find so disposed to connect themselves with any of the churches around them. But it should be known that there are those, who, while not at all inclined to form this connection, and who are not even to be induced to form it, yet become disposed, and even strongly so, to assemble for religious worship and instruction, provided this worship shall be conducted, and this instruction given, by the individual who has been the instrument of calling their attention to religion, and of exciting their interest in it. Very strong is the personal attachment which is formed between many, and him with whom they have been connected through the offices of this ministry; and the minister thus becomes to them a centre of sympathy and union, as no other can be. The minister at large should therefore be one who can preach, and preach with effect. He should be a preacher who has proved himself acceptable to those for whose spiritual good he is to labour. And having gathered a religious society, and obtained a chapel in which they shall regularly assemble for the offices of Christian worship and instruction, I would have him interchange Sabbatical labours with the ministers of the churches around him, as these ministers interchange their labours with one another. Thus would I have a bond of union formed with these churches, and a generous and affectionate sympathy maintained between them, and the religious societies gathered by the ministers at large. Through the ministry at large, I would thus enable our churches to co-operate in the blessed work of extending Christian sympathies and influences to every family and individual without their own limits; and even to the poorest and the most abject and lost who shall be found willing to receive them. Thus would I have our ministry to be in fact a ministry of the churches of Christ for the widest possible extension of the objects and blessings of Christianity in cities. Nor do I believe that any means can be devised by which so much would be done to give a new life to our churches, to infuse into them the spirit of Christ and of humanity, to expel selfishness and worldliness from them, to bind the poor to the rich and the rich to the poor, and to secure the most desirable results to the whole Christian ministry in cities, as by the appointment and maintenance, to the extent demanded for it, of such a Ministry at Large in them."—*Principel's and Results of the Ministry at Large in Boston*, pp. 180—182.

II. The equality of all Mankind, in the only sense in which equality can be claimed, that of God's equal love for all, and of the equal relation of each to the infinite source of thought, life, and everlasting progress, Dr. Tuckerman realized with a force and truthfulness that exposed to him the practical departures from this spiritual principle of equality and of brotherhood, which Society, in all its departments, exhibits and sanctions. How few are able to look upon mankind with this equal eye; and if in any thing they are themselves more distinguished and richly endowed, to remember that it is in fact a call upon them for gratitude to Him who made them to differ,—and for humility and brotherly consideration towards those who, being of the same nature, and capable of the same enjoyments, have by no fault of theirs been less richly gifted, or prosperously placed, and who may yet in the providence of God have a noble course to run, and noble destinies to work out. There is no respect in which the truly spiritual estimate of Christianity, the regard it has for men for the sake of their nature, independently of the things that surround them, and the place in which they may be found, has so conspicuous an opportunity to manifest its divine temper, and to show the simplicity of moral greatness,—for, owing to the prevailing deficiency of this Christian sentiment, the lowly in lot and condition have not been taught to respect themselves, to know exactly what things degrade and what do not,—and even the best men, whose hearts are right, and whose moral estimates are true, cannot altogether escape, in some part of their demeanour, the spirit and manners of the times. The equality Christianity would establish is not one that would abolish the differences of offices, of employments, of qualifications for varying services, and of corresponding reputations and dignities, for these are ineffaceable and fixed by God in our very nature —but it is an equality that would deprive no man of brotherly respect because of his condition,—that would deprive no man of brotherly sympathy because of his destitution, or apparent inability to be to us a benefactor in return,—and that would deprive no man of brotherly forbearance and supports because of his exposure and his sins. It is an equality of nature, that acknowledges no differences to be permanent but the differences of character; an equality of honour, wherever there is an equality of virtue, though existing for a time under a system, in which, for the highest moral purposes, and with a view to educate and to give force to the spiritual principle in our nature, God creates outward distinctions between men. The inequalities of circumstances and conditions, of which we make so much, and which we charge upon God, as if *He* regarded the artificial separations between man and man,—which we convert into arguments, or at least difficulties, against the impartiality of His Providence, are, in the highest view of them, His mode of testing and giving force to the spiritual and brotherly sentiment within us. What is it that fails, but our own strength of Christian affection, in this world of inequality and separation? We complain of God's unequal treatment, when the fact is that it is our own spirit of humanity that is too feeble to resist the outward temptations, and bear the outward burdens, and identify itself with every form of man. If there is inequality of condition, its moral purpose is, that man may manifest the spirit of the one Father, and make himself the minister of God's equal love. In this view of our natural equality, and of the education of our spiritual sympathies, God trusts His children to the love and care of their brethren; necessity and degradation are occasions to call out the force of the Christian sentiment,—and our times of purest fellowship with the merciful and equal spirit of our Father are in the opportunities that sins, sorrows, and wants supply. In the moral world God does nothing of Himself, but to supply the materials for man's workmanship. God wills, but man must execute; and if man will not execute what God wills, it is not that *He* is unfatherly, but that *we* are unbrotherly. If we will not distribute His gifts so as to provide equally for the equal nature of all, as far as moral and economic laws permit, all this proves nothing against there being a Father's heart in heaven, whatever it may prove against there being a brother's heart on earth. And if God's strong hand does not of itself adjust these inequalities,—it is because *that* would be to destroy our Moral Education, to take away our most spiritual work on Earth, and our fittest preparation for Heaven. We are not so vain, so impious, as to think, that it is from peculiar love of *us*, that God has favoured us above those whom physical temptation brutalizes, and social darkness keeps enslaved. No,—He provides but a school for human character,—he gives but scope for human affections to prove their genuineness and worth,—he makes the moral chaos only that the strong and noble spirit of humanity may brood over it, and mould it to a new creation of intelligence and order, more glorious than that over which the morning stars sang together, and the angels of God shouted for joy. God does all this whenever His good spirit leads us to do it,—and it is in order that *we* may be the doers of it, that He has left it undone. Christianity declares the equal relations of all men to the universal Parent; and it imposes an obligation on every heart that realizes this Christian sentiment, to become an instrument of God for equalizing, as far as may be, the moral condition of all His children. This was the spirit which filled the life, and supplied the strength of the Founder of the Ministry to the Poor,—and which seemed to set him apart as a loftier and nobler being, even among those who in all intellectual distinctions might perhaps be considered his superiors. But such, always, is the force of character that belongs to a man whose moral estimates are true and unperverted.

III. Perhaps in no respect did Dr. Tuckerman manifest more strongly Christ's spirit of humanity, than in his sympathy with the temptations, and in his consideration for the difficulties of the morally exposed. We believe it was his opinion, an opinion that certainly grows upon us with the experience of life, that the comparative Morality of the several classes of Society is nearly equal; and that when the circumstances of peculiar exposure, neglect, ignorance, and absence of refining influences and resources are taken into the account, the moral strength of the poor, —the control of principle over temptation, appetite and passion,—the preservation of so much of the beauty of humanity, are worthy to be our admiration and encouragement; to convey to us a lesson of humility for ourselves and of hope for them; and to inspire us with a meek confidence in our nature. And truly when we look upon the prosperous and the prospered,—when we think how many homes there are that have every thing to bless them but the simplicity of virtue, and consciences at peace,—how many hearts there are that might beat happily themselves, and make the happiness of many, but for the weakness of the moral principle within them, the feebleness of the will,—and how much of spiritual protection there is around these favoured yet failing ones,—how much of pure enjoyments, and blessed substitutes for sinful pleasures,—how much of charmed influences, of moral entreaty, of gentle persuasions, that might keep right any heart that was only kind, even if it was not upright and good,—and with what levity all this can be set at nought, the present violated, and the future burdened with its sorrow and its curse, by hearts that are yet not hearts of stone,—when we remember this neither our sympathies nor our judgment can refuse to yield themselves up to that noble man, who with a brother's heart descends into the lowest depths of exposed humanity, and tells us that if we knew all that it had to suffer, and all that it had to resist, and the few helps that were afforded to it in that sad and uncheered conflict, our distrusts would often be changed into reverence and respect, and our self-complacency into bitter contrition and shame. We must show in his own words his spirit of humanity, in his respect even for the fallen, his appreciation of their temptations, and his consequent power to reach the springs of good in a soul, and to become to it a Saviour. He is describing the manner in which he gained access to the hearts and consciences of the morally destitute to whom he ministered:—

"We are now within the family. We may have been led to it by a child; or we may have entered to learn whether we could aid the parents in placing or keeping their children at school; or we have learned that they have asked for alms, and have called upon them to ascertain what are their necessities; or perhaps, for this is very common, our visit to one family, in which we have met one or two of the neighbourhood, has led to a request that we would visit another. And we are kindly received. Let us then begin our work.

"One morning I entered a room that I might make some inquiry respecting a family. Every thing in this room was in confusion. The floor, the furniture, and the dress of the woman whom I saw there, were alike filthy; and a man was lying upon the bed in the deep sleep of thorough intoxication. I had never before been in that room. But it was a matter of course that I should at once learn what I could of this family. And I soon learned from the wife that her husband was a journeyman mechanic, and abundantly able to provide for his family, if he would but give up the use of strong drink. It was my practice on Sunday to visit certain families, in which the husband and father was seldom to be found at home on other days, except at meal times. I therefore told this woman that I would see her again on Sunday, when I hoped to be able to speak to her husband. She expressed her wish that I would, and I left her. At nine o'clock on the following Sunday morning I was there again. I knocked at the door, and entered. The man whom I had seen upon the bed on the preceding Friday now stood before me. I said to his wife, 'You have mentioned my intention to call here this morning.'—'No, sir,' she replied. Her husband was obviously much surprised at seeing me enter his room. I therefore immediately offered him my hand, which he accepted; and I said to him, 'I was here on Friday morning, and saw you upon the bed; and have taken the liberty to call upon you.' We were all soon seated. I did not say to this man, 'I saw you *drunk* upon your bed.' He well knew what was the condition in which I had seen him. At once, however, we entered upon the subject upon which I wished to communicate with him. I addressed him with the respect due to a man, and the interest due to a brother. He was touched; affected; and within half-an-hour threw open his whole heart to me. He assured me that he would not taste any intoxicating drink till he should see me on the next Sunday. At that time I was with him again, and had the testimony of his wife that he had been faithful to his promise. I passed another half-hour with him. We were already friends. Again he engaged to go through the week without tasting anything which could produce intoxication. Again, and again, and again he renewed his pledge to me, and was faithful to it. After six or eight weeks I found him on Sunday morning in a new suit of clothes,—the fruits of his own earnings. Soon a new cooking stove was provided. The dress of his wife also was clean and comfortable. And never shall I forget the bright and happy expression with which she one morning said to me, 'I have now been married twenty years; and in all those years I have not been so happy as I have been during the last three months.' Had I treated this man otherwise than with respect, and sympathy, how would he have received me, and how would he have treated my endeavours to reclaim him from intemperance?" *Principles and Results of the Ministry at Large,* pp. 107—109.

There is a feeling (not a generous one) entertained by some, both here and in America, arising out of a want of sympathy with, and a due understanding of the kind of Greatness that belonged to him, that Dr. Tuckerman was an over-estimated man. To men without fervour themselves, there is nothing so painful, so troublesome, as the enthusiasm of another. Earnest feeling, especially when it takes a practical direction, and presses upon languid men a sense of their obligations, becomes through the self applications of conscience so much of a rebuke, that it is not unfrequently resented and disliked as a personal attack and annoyance. In such circumstances there is a reaction against the individual who awakens these uncomfortable sensations, and a not unnatural tendency to reduce the importance that attaches to his disturbing words.

There is also, we think, a very undue proportion allowed to the simply Intellectual, the original or brilliant in Thought, in the elements that are supposed to constitute a great man. It is not understood that energy of Feeling,—a nature capable of receiving and of retaining the truest and deepest moral sentiments,—of being stamped with the noblest Image of God, does indeed imply the presence, and in a very high state, of all the loftiest qualities of Mind, intellectual as well as moral. No man is susceptible of the highest forms of Goodness without a nobly developed Intellect. The perfection of the moral man can by no possibility be separated from the perfection of the intellectual,—from the susceptibilities, the capacities, the ascendancy, the right vision and estimates of the *mental* portion of our Nature. In proportion to his moral perfectness, a man must be endowed with quickness of sympathy in all directions,—comprehensiveness of thought,—force, freedom, and activity of mind,—an enlargedness and power of the whole intellectual being. This was the character of Dr. Tuckerman's intellect. It manifested itself in the Power to understand and to receive all Moral Truth,—and to sympathise with all moral states. We know no Greatness higher than this, even *mentally* considered. It implies a predominance, and a decided force and comprehensiveness, in the intellectual character. Brilliancy, cleverness, original thoughts, pointed or energetic forms of expression, imagination, or even the powers of combination, are not the only signs of intellectual greatness. Force of sentiment, a mind *penetrated by a truth*, freshness and moral earnestness that manifest the deep springs of the spirit that produces them, the power of realizing, above other men, feelings and views which all men know by name,—this after all is the true Greatness even of Thought.

The remarkable wisdom with which Dr. Tuckerman conducted the practical departments of his ministry; his remarkable power of application to individual minds and cases; the remarkable power he had of restraining all his tenderness and compassion, if he thought that suffering was necessary for the child of retribution, and that interference might injure a lesson from God; the remarkable success with which he brought into triumphant existence and living efficacy, *the theory of a ministry to the poor*,—these establish incontestably the solid, the practical, and the discriminating character of his Intellect. He bore that truest mark of Greatness,—that he realized his own ideals,—and showed his most fervent spirit in practical and successful applications. We owe it to him, that no faint hearted man, without faith in his nature or in his God, has now the power to call a Ministry to the Poor, *an experiment*. We owe it to him that no languid man can now breathe the chill imputation of *impracticableness*, over this Christian enterprise. This surely is Greatness of the highest order,—the successful accomplishment at once of the noblest, and of the most difficult objects.

Upon a review of the life of this genuine man, as well as of all other moral benefactors of their Race whom memory passes before us, we are struck with the kind of Christianity, which, from these examples, asserts itself to be alone endowed with power to produce great moral changes in the world. It is that Christianity which derives its inspiration, its power to work miracles, and remove mountains from its intense spirit of humanity. It is the original inspiration of Christ himself. " The spirit of the Lord is upon me because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor." Whoever feels that to be his mission is, indeed, inspired of God; he is a partaker of the spirit of his Father, and he will achieve his objects, for greater is the spirit that is in him than the spirit that is in the world. It is not the intellectual, but the living Christianity that must save the world. It is the eloquence of the life, and the eloquence of love, and not in any respect the eloquence of the mind or of the tongue, that leads souls faithful captives, and weds them lastingly to heavenly things. We must have Christianity administered as Christ administered it, his own spirit, in his communications with his fellow men, being its true embodyment and expression, before any great spiritual revolutions are to take place in Society. Without this, it has long since been manifest, that the preaching of men or of angels, is as vain as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. The moral evil is the blighting evil, in fact the only evil in the world,—and for the most part an evil spirit departs from us, only when a brighter and a purer spirit makes itself known to us, kindles the dying aspiration within, lifts us into its own sphere, and by taking us within its companionship and regards, endows us at last with independent vitality and self respect. It is remarkable that three men whom our connexion has lately lost, men whose practical influence was, perhaps unequalled, all owed their distinction, their great but just influence, to nothing but their moral genuineness, their living Christianity. I speak of Dr. Tuckerman, of Dr. Follen, and of Dr. Carpenter. These men were not in any other respects set above their fellows,—they were not rarely endowed with genius, or with intellectual gifts,—but such in them was the force of the Christian Spirit of humanity, that it set upon them the seal of a moral Greatness, and no where in the world could they have gone without exercising a strong influence upon the moral life of others, and being at once acknowledged and honoured as remarkable men. What a lesson is this of the mode in which Christianity is to enter into powerful action on mankind. If we are to have Christian Creeds, summaries of Christianity, why should we not have a Creed stating and recognising our spiritual relations, and the Christian sentiments flowing out of them,—the fatherhood of God; the brotherhood of Man; the common nature, the common sympathies, the common and everlasting destinies and home? Is it not a strange thing to say that such a Creed has never been constructed,—nor subscription to the spirit of it required?

We have spoke of these excellent men as having no Greatness but that which is indeed the greatest, the force of the spirit of humanity in them, the inspiration of Christ, not surely to reduce their honours, but to bring them, with respect to those distinctions in which their power lay, within the imitation of every one. We might all open our hearts to spiritual estimates of man, of life, of happiness, and clothe ourselves with the mighty power of God, the power of Reality and Truth. The enthusiasm required for such a service is not excitement, nor excited feelings, but a right appreciation of humanity, a truthfulness and simplicity of the moral nature, a calmness and force of sympathy arising out of spiritual views of man, and a trust in principles and in God that will sustain all disappointments, and combat all difficulties. "The earnestness required," says Dr. Tuckerman himself, "is the earnestness of a Christian appreciation of human beings, and of moral and spiritual interests. It is the earnestness which is awakened in the soul by a feeling of its own relation to God, and of its relation to all men as equally children of God. It is earnestness awakened by interest in man in view of God's purposes respecting him; of the difficulties of Man's condition in respect to these purposes; of the greatness of man's dangers and sufferings, and of his need of sympathy and moral aid: and not less than all these, by the conviction that we may be to these sufferers instruments of the sympathy and moral aid they so strongly need. It is earnestness in the work of obviating moral difficulties, where these difficulties are too great to be overcome by those in whose path they lie; of strengthening those who are ready to sink under their trials; and of blessing as many as we may, as they could not otherwise be blessed than through the gospel.—"But, I pray, let it be the earnestness of calm, deep, and strong conviction; the hallowed earnestness of a Christian estimation of man; of clear conceptions of moral interests as the highest of all interests; and of a corresponding sensibility of human difficulties and sufferings, as God's calls, for the sympathy and aid of those who can rescue the exposed, give relief to heavily burdened souls, show their danger to those who are insensible of it, stretch a helping hand to those who are struggling for life, and, it may be, even save from moral death those who shall be found upon the very verge of it."

And he adds, with remarkable self knowledge: "Even this earnestness, it may be upon certain occasions, and in certain individuals, will have outbreaks in a form to expose it in some minds to the imputation of enthusiasm. I am aware that I have so *spoken*, as to have given some ground for this imputation to myself, and am therefore more solicitous for the correction of mistake upon the subject. But I believe that so I have never written. From the beginning of my service to this hour, I have had an ever deepening and strengthening conviction of its claims, as identical with the claims of the highest principles and objects of Christianity. To these principles and objects I have constantly referred in asserting the claims of this ministry. If upon these it cannot find a resting place, I will be the first to say, let it fall and come to nought."—*Results of the Ministry at Large*, p. 192.

We have endeavoured to apprehend the principles, and to enter into the spirit of this good man; we will not dwell further upon the moral of his life; the power of character best speaks for itself. If we have sympathies with his spirit of humanity, it will exert on us its own influences, and work its own works. His spirit may be perpetuated amongst us, for it is the inspiration of the Lord in all who are truly His children,—and it never dies.

J. H. T.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

I. Disquisitions on the Theology and Metaphysics of Scripture; with strictures on various current opinions in Divinity and Philosophy, connected with these subjects. By Andrew Carmichael, M. R. I. A. 2 vols. 8vo.

We hail with peculiar pleasure a work on such subjects from the pen of a layman, especially when written with such candour and good feeling as are displayed in every part of the two volumes of which the work consists. Mr. Carmichael is a highly respected legal practitioner, well versed in the laws of evidence, and possessed of a spirit of patient as well as of free inquiry. He became a Unitarian from conviction, and was for many years the frequent companion and intimate friend, as well as an attendant on the ministry of the late excellent and much lamented Dr. Armstrong. The dedication refers to this intimacy, and a postscript, added after the Dr.'s removal, alludes feelingly to that event. The preface states the origin of the undertaking.

> "Six or seven years ago, two very young friends of mine, whose intelligence and acquirements would do honour to maturer years, were discussing with me the absurdity of many religious opinions which have contrived to obtain a permanent tenure in the world, without being able to deduce any title from Scripture; and we agreed that if the compounders of creeds and articles had been under the obligation of expressing them in the language of the sacred writings, very few of the most prevalent among them would ever have started into existence; and that on the contrary, if we could extract from the Bible all the theology and metaphysics it contains, without omitting a necessary word, or introducing one not already in the context, we should possess in perfect purity all the doctrines of religion which it is requisite, or reasonable, or safe to believe."

To oblige and serve his young friends Mr. C. undertook the task proposed, and having completed it, found that though the language was abridged, he could scarcely have transcribed less than one third of the sacred volume. This was divided into four Parts, each containing many sections. From this laborious work he acquired a more intimate knowledge of the scriptures, and, as he observes, "it enabled me to discriminate between what I was to believe and what I was to disbelieve, and to disencumber the doctrines of scripture from those of articles, creeds and confessions."

In the course of his investigation he was induced to believe,—

> "That there are some falsifications of the sacred text—some disputed questions as to the fulfilment of prophecies—some requisite analysis to decide how far a miracle consisted of natural, and how far of marvellous ingredients, and that much scrutiny is needed to judge of the authenticity of the various writings comprised in the sacred volume; and to what extent they may rationally be received as the inspired word of God."

The steps he took to satisfy himself on these points lead to the work announced at the head of this article; in which work he has combined quotations from various publications with many original remarks, which were discussed in a group of friends, and which appear to have encountered opposition. For the results the author is alone responsible. The following passages of the Preface are we think creditable to Mr. C., and afford a good example for others.

> "With respect to the force and weight of particular texts, I have been always desirous to consider them in a natural and just point of view; and to conform, as far as was reasonable, to the received canons of Biblical Criticism."—"Wherever I assert my liberty, let it be to my shame, if it be not accompanied with at least some show of reason."—"With all my errors and imperfections, I may conscientiously aver that truth, and the cause of truth, has been always my fixed and determinate object."
>
> "In pursuing these investigations, I felt but little solicitude to consult theological works or enter into the opinions of divines or controversialists. I was much more anxious to form an unbiassed judgment for myself on simply examining the texts of Scripture as given in the authorised version; and wherever a doubt arose, to advert solely to Walton's Polyglott, or Griesbach's Greek Testament, or both, as the point in question required."

Mr. C. does not pretend to a knowledge of the Oriental languages, which he consulted through the medium of the Latin translation, and he is modest and unassuming with regard to his qualifications for the task from varied learning, but it is manifest that his heart was in the work, and truth his only object.

> "I am persuaded that I have not neglected the consideration of any text, whether of much or little importance in the regions of controversy. If I have done so, it has been through inadvertence, and I shall feel grateful to any one who will point out the defect."

We might introduce much more which we conceive honourable to the writer, but we hope that we have quoted enough to show his object and the spirit in which he has written. Some pages of the Preface are occupied with an argument against any national religion. It is discussed calmly and judiciously, and is followed by a paragraph we shall quote.

> "Were this happy consummation (viz. each sect relying on its own resources) arrived, the truths of the Gospel would then have fair play. No divine would be blinded by the dazzling inducements held out by the State, and few of exalted minds would submit to the trammels imposed by an ignorant flock. Congregations would grow round the preacher who plainly and fearlessly taught the pure doctrines of Christ, undefiled by any gross or earthly admixture. But while a sectarian assemblage remained to relish the fictions of men, in preference to the truths from above, enough would still be found to supply the demand, their intelligence on a level with that of their followers, yet adding to the general welfare; for any religion is better than none; and the best for every man, surely, is that which he can best understand, and by which he can most readily profit and improve. No one can object to this truth; and it leads to a simple inquiry, the simple answer to which is equally pregnant with truth, could men but be brought to reply without passion or prejudice. From the highest to the lowliest as to social condition, from the richest to the poorest as to mental cultivation, what is that religion which without obscurity, mystery or contradiction brings conviction to every understanding, and profit and improvement to every heart? Let others reply as they will, I answer, the pure, unadulterated religion of the Gospel."

After some speculations on the best way of removing difficulties caused by existing establishments, he observes that till measures can be taken,

> "Government has but three little duties to perform. 1. To maintain the unalienable rights of private judgment and preserve its free exercise from violence and oppression. 2. To secure the enjoyment of their property to every church, sect and congregation, and establish a limitation and barrier against the rapacious attempts of bigots and fanatics, who under the mask of Christians and saints would unscrupulously spoil and plunder their brethren. 3. To provide for the people a general system of education, calculated to improve their understandings and feelings, and mould them into moral, religious and industrious members of the community, and loyal, independent and high-minded subjects of the State."

Referring to the declaration "that Christianity is part of the laws of England," after quoting the decisions on which it rests, he concludes,—

> "It therefore is manifest that it is Christianity, emphatically the religion of CHRIST, and not the religion of convocations, synods or councils, that is part and parcel of the laws of England; that it is the doctrines *he* taught, and not the doctrines of creeds, confessions or articles, which should govern the decisions of judges and the verdicts of juries. How much, then, ought judges and juries to be on their guard, lest in contests between litigating sects, they should be more influenced by prejudice than by truth, and beware, that in lending their authority to

extinguish any lamp of religion, they do not unintentionally darken the pure light of the Gospel."

Some remarks follow on the state of the country and of the effects of some doctrines, especially sacrificial atonement, on the morals of the people; but we must hasten to the conclusion of the Preface.

> "I can have no motive but the love of truth, no object but the good of society; while, without enthusiasm and almost without hope, I submit the consummation of my labours to your candid, unbiassed, deliberate judgment. With all the indifference to earthly considerations, but with all the seriousness and sincerity of one who knows that he is approaching and feels that he may be standing on the brink of the grave, I leave this my last bequest as the best legacy I can bestow on the *most* or the *least* reflecting, the *most* or *least* credulous of my survivors. If on an honest and conscientious comparison, you are satisfied that it does not correspond with the truths of the Gospel as originally announced to mankind, then reject, disown, and disclaim it: but if, on the contrary, you unexpectedly find that it presents those truths of heaven, divested of the errors, corruptions and falsehoods of earth, you are then called to a different but equally imperative duty. *Mine* I have endeavoured to perform fearlessly, temperately, impartially and faithfully: yours demands a full measure of similar feelings. But, whatever be the result, let this not escape your reflections, 'that if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought, but if it be of God ye cannot overthrow it.'"

The work so introduced consists of seven disquisitions; the first on the *authenticity* and *inspiration* of the Scriptures—in which the author maintains views not much differing from those of the Rev. J. Martineau, whom he quotes with approbation. There are in the last section some just strictures on what is called 'plenary inspiration.' The second disquisition is on the CREATION, and includes many remarks on the opinions of Kirwan, Buckland, Bremser and others. The third is on the DEITY, and treats separately of the various opinions respecting the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; to each of which a chapter is devoted, and a fourth one to the Trinity. The fourth disquisition is on the "marvellous incidents of Scripture," which include all modes of divine intervention. Miracles and prophecies undergo an individual as well as a general examination, and many distinctions are made as to the degree of authority of each. We have next "the scheme of salvation," considered under various heads of faith, works, atonement, &c. Then follows a sixth on "doctrines involving the question of liberty and necessity," which is divided into chapters on Predestination, Election and Grace. The seventh and concluding one is "on a Future State," in the last chapter of which is "a general review of the conclusions resulting from the whole of these disquisitions." We must find room for the conclusion, which cannot, we think, be read without interest, an interest which it is hoped will lead many to the work itself, which will amply repay the attention bestowed on it.

"Thus my task is at length accomplished, and accomplished, I hope, without offence to God or to man. But man may take offence where God would not. If God knows that I looked to no other object but the light of that truth which must redound to his glory, whether beaming from the revelations of nature or the revelations of Scripture, it may well be a matter of indifference to me whether man may discredit, or, without discrediting, deny that this has been my motive. Early prepossessions are not easily overcome; and knowing the difficulty with which I myself struggled, from darkness into day, I can feel no displeasure against those whose opinions differ from mine; and towards those who conscientiously differ from me, I can harbour no sentiment but deference and respect. They may look on my labours with a different eye from that with which I venture, myself, to regard them. They cannot perceive, and therefore they will not admit, that I have discharged an invidious, yet a useful and salutary duty. But let me not be thought to arrogate to myself even the shadow of peculiar desert. Numbers have been engaged in the self-same investigations, and with abilities and acquirements to which I have no title, attended by successes and triumphs to which I have no pretensions; yet I may be proud of striving in the same cause, however inadequate to the competition. Our aim and end are the same; to restore the religion of Christ to that primitive purity in which it was bequeathed to mankind by him and his apostles; and to disembarrass its divine and unerring tenor from the impurities and profanations of creeds, decretals, and statutes, confessions and articles with which human follies, prejudices, and interests have overloaded and disgraced it.

"Its hallowed founder established it on an everlasting rock. Sublime in majestic simplicity, resplendent in spotless purity, the magnificent edifice opened its gates to all mankind, and He whom the heaven of heavens cannot contain, made it his dwelling. But man was not contented with this temple of God, nor with the worship prescribed by his authorized messengers. His Messiah was placed beside him on the throne of Omnipotence; and shrines were erected, and chapels consecrated to the children of men. The fabrick has been disfigured within and without: its capacious area is divided and partitioned into petty sectarian compartments; its ample porticoes have been blocked up, and its wide portals narrowed and contracted; fantastic minarets, pinnacles, and spires, have been added with Gothic profusion to the once simple but now complicated structure, and to conceal the contrast between the living marble and the meaner materials of these base excrescences, the whole has been covered with a worthless crust, obliterating the original splendour, and forming an unnatural but specious consistency.

"To renew the degraded glories of the sacred pile; to remove every unholy partition, every barbarous outwork and arbitrary barrier, superadded by the unauthorized caprices of men; to cleanse away the debasing incrustations from pillar, pier and entablature; to open again the magnificent porticoes and ample portals to the nations of the earth, —this were an achievement worthy of the efforts of men ambitious of the favour of God. Prospering under the influence of that favour, may they soon and effectually accomplish their enterprise, so that Christendom may at length behold, as at first, in all its majestic and awful simplicity, that temple which was predestined to overshadow the congregated tribes of mankind, its foundations resting on the Rock of Ages, its dome aspiring to heaven, it splendours reflected in the unbounded ocean! or if, incapable of such reflection, the boisterous surges rage against it, still shall it be seen unmoved and immoveable, defying their clamour, and rolling them back discomfited and broken from its imperishable basis!"—Vol. ii., pp. 403, 404.

II. Discourses. By John Cameron.

These consist of, 1. The true Enfranchisement; 2. The Men of Old; 3. Christian Endeavour and Achievement; 4. The honest Workman. We hail with pleasure the appearance of a volume of sermons, for the publication of which there seems to be some reason. Nothing is more perplexing at times than to discover for what conceivable object, a thick octavo volume of thirty or forty extremely sensible but extremely common-place sermons has been given to the world. That they are of a useful, probably the most useful character, as matter prepared from week to week for a mixed audience of young and old, rich and poor, learned and unlearned people, who have all in common with the preacher himself weekly if not daily need of being reminded of the leading duties of man, and "the conclusion of the whole matter," we feel oft-times most eager to confess. But why, with it is to be hoped many thousands of preachers in our island saying virtually the same thing, and saying it too not in the coldness of the silent type, but with the earnestness of impressed manner, and the power of their own character to back it, the world should have inflicted upon it in a printed form a republication of what hath been so very many times uttered and written in almost the same words, if not in better, "puzzles the brain." But in the little volume before us there really is something distinctive. The author has selected from his stores what he thought the most valuable, and has refused to eke out a larger volume, by overlaying his gold with dross. To sermon readers in general the style will appear peculiar as a pulpit-style. But we know of no reason why a man should pare down his individuality to any supposed conventional form, and ceasing to be himself, become the tame representative of a class. We therefore rejoice to see a preacher laying for a moment aside the gown and cassock which confuses him with ten thousand others, come forth in his own form, *in propriâ personâ*, that we may see what manner of man he himself is.

No one will read two pages of these Sermons without discovering who is Mr. Cameron's prototype as a writer. A deep admiration and a thorough appreciation of Thomas Carlyle's mind have made him adopt often indeed his thoughts, but very extensively his mode of expressing them. But both are yet so native to the man, that you see at once that this is the result of a spirit of congeniality, and not of a spirit of imitation. He is besides too earnest in his work ever to fall into the good-humoured cynicism, or the apparent affectation, which would render Carlyle's style, if fully adopted, unsuitable for the class of subjects which Mr. Cameron handles. We shall say nothing of the extreme felicity of expression, and the spirited eloquence of thought, which characterize many portions of the volume before us, as the extracts which we shall presently lay before the reader, will be abundantly sufficient to enable him to judge for himself. The whole volume is conceived in the truest apprehension of the real nature and object of Christianity. There is a generosity in its tone, and comprehensiveness in its spirit, which show that the author cometh of no sect, but can recognize a Christian brother wherever there is the heart of Christ. That our praise may pass for what it is, sincere and yet not undiscriminating, one word of friendly criticism before we proceed to the promised extracts. Mr. Cameron should beware of two things : how he repeats too often expressions and quotations " of mark." Common words may be often repeated, uncommon ones may not, or they lose their effect. In the next place he should sedulously resist the same tendency on a larger scale, of letting his subjects run into one another, by running into one channel, delved unproportionably deep. Every sermon should have a rigidly defined object, and the writer of it should refuse to listen to any solicitations to wander from the path that leads to it, or he will find, when he comes into what ought to be a fresh track, that he has anticipated it, wandered on it before, and as a trespasser. The danger of this tendency in a writer is, that it leads him to repeat himself, and " live upon the ghosts of his past thoughts."

Know thyself.

" Let us possess our souls with convictions absolute, that if we are in our own eyes good beyond the need of improvement, and the world, look to it from any point of vision, so reformed as to need no further reformation, we are in the shadow, nay rather in the sepulchre of the conventional, in the rotten wrappage of usages, that torn away from us there were a mummy to be looked at, not a living man. Tell me, can you say from what you know of your own hearts, that had you lived in the days of the Master, you would have adventured to come even by night to him, the great moral reformer, whose hand was then against every man, and against whom was every man's hand—who stood alone doing battle, single-handed against the world. Would you have echoed the word—would you have repeated the action of this man, the most questionable of his generation, who stood resolute in calm strength, confronting all constituted authorities? would you have called him Master? would you have companied with the Galilean fishermen? would you have given up the old for the new, old profitable distinctions—uppermost rooms at feasts and chief places in the synagogues, for the new questionable, or disreputable man—wherein the fewest could see any beauty that they should desire him? Would you have seen in this man, in the garb of a peasant, the greatest of men, 'the highest embodied possibility of human nature,' and have said in heart—'Whither thou goest I will go, and where thou diest will I die—God do so to me, and more also, if aught but death part thee and me?' would you have said of this daring innovator, 'This is the Son of God,' or cried out, 'Away with him, away with him, crucify him, crucify him?' How little know you of your own hearts if you dare answer that you would have put yourselves among that little band of heroes who left all and followed him 'who had not where to lay his head.' Physical courage may be had for a shilling a day, but the moral heroism that fears nothing but wrong-doing, that will seek truth and go on fearlessly whither the truth may lead, turning neither to the right hand nor to the left by any thought of profit—this, the highest that we can be—where is it? who shall tell us where to find it? 'To die for truth,' says Richter, 'is not to die for one's country, but to die for the world.'"

Intellectual progress not necessarily moral progress.

"And now introducing our third witness—What is the testimony of *experience*? In adding truth to truth, did you add virtue to virtue? During the last five, or ten, or fifteen years, you increased your knowledge by considerable additions. Are you conscious of a like increase in wisdom? in pure endeavour to make yourself and other men what you and they ought to be? Or can you say, after a sincere retrospect of your life for any number of years, that the moral powers of your nature have moved abreast with the intellectual in emulous equable progression? By study of the best that art can create you have acquired a finer appreciative sense in the æsthetic palate. Is your relish keener now than heretofore for the good and true? On that educational nurture do you grow godlike? With your increase in scientific information do you live more and more as ever under the great Taskmaster's eye? Do you, after all that laborious literary pains-taking, keep the heart with all diligence? nay in what that taught, did it teach you that this is the fountain out of which are the issues of life?"

The lover of literary lore questioned.

"Shew us the man who is or who would be thought to be a great reader, and we shall ask him a few questions touching his vast literary accumulations, to help him to think soberly of himself, and his possessions, and if we can, to prove even to him the literary millionaire, that his grains of gold dust are not Eldorado and Golconda, or rather that in our memory there is 'an equal poverty of books and men.' Walk into the confessional learned man of the capital, or marvellous man of the provinces, and speak out honestly the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Nay without making a noticeable man bear witness against himself, let us take from among a handful of men of some literary culture any one of the brotherhood, and the chances greatly are that his Italian literature is that old inseparable triumvirate Dante, Petrach, and Boccaccio, and that famous duumvirate Ariosto and Tasso, not the works of these men, but their names, for without setting charity at nought, it may be questioned, though he take his place among the literary brotherhood, whether he have the thing which the word literature is held to indicate. Easy is it to make a little, a very little reading go a great way, especially among those who are themselves no holders of stock, and if a man have heard of the Divina Commedia that it is divided into three parts or compartments, hell, purgatory, and paradise, and has read or heard of the often quoted passage about Ugolino, and that other about Francesca di Rimini, what is to hinder him comporting himself as if he were native and endued unto the Dantean element? Many a man has managed by the help of four words, Neri and Bianchi, Guelph, and Ghibelline, to make others think him very learned in the older history of Italy."

Time and space.

"So true is it that men rest from their labours and their works do follow them. Time and space are God's sextons, and in the bosom of eternity they dig the grave of nations."

The forgotten great.

"From the time that Alexander marched his Macedonians to the Indus, bringing for an hour the west into contact with the east, down to the time of our earliest voyages, that mysterious India is to us as if it were not—a revolving light in the great deep of time—alternating in light and darkness once in two thousand years. During that period, and in that region between Ganges and Indus, five hundred thousand millions lived and died—they lived and died. In these two words we give all that men know or care to know of their history. Yet was it in this region that the central fires of man's wild heart upheaved from its foundations the social structure in dread accumulation of strata upon strata. This was the theatre of lawless aggression, and mad overthrow of dynasties, of revolution within revolution, and the thunder-crash and wreckage of Empires as of icebergs in some tempestuous sea. Cross now the Hymalaiah barrier, "gigantic mountains rough with crags," into the land of the untamed Tartar nomades who, pouring down from their bleak steppes with the impetuosity of mountain torrents, overran the face of the earth. Of their indomitable Tartar leaders one yet lives in the letters of his name, but of his achievements the fewest can narrate enough to please the curious ear of a child. Of the mighty Zengis who can tell the achievements? how do you name his battle-fields? where is *his* field of Austerlitz and Marengo? what cities did he burn to ashes? tell us what kings did he overthrow? whom took he captive? where is the muster-toll of his once too famous captains? Give us the names of his thirty mighty men of valour—nay give us even the name of his three mightiest, who was *his* 'Bravest of the Brave?' What was their strategie, their tactic, their art of war offensive and defensive? A thousand years ago time eat horseman and horse to the bone—the earth consumed them to ashes—their memory and their name is gone for ever. So much for man-destroying Zengis. But about other Quellers of the nations may we not put questions which it is easier to ask than to answer. Did Badjazet beat Tamerlane or Tamerlane Badjazet? was it that put this or this put that into the iron cage? Tamerlane Badjazet or Badjazet Tamerlane? which of these world-compellers was it that bowed down for the other to mount on horseback? what was the cause they fought for? and which of them was in the issue victorious? Here comes another troop of the men who 'sought the bubble reputation.' Their names with the names of many other famous as they are written in the muster roll of their great Leader —Helez, Ira, Abiezer, Mebunnai, Maharai, Zelek, Meliphelet, Ira the Tekoite, and Ira the Ithrite, Azmareth and Abi-albon, mighty captains all, but of what great leader were they the captains? Tell us of their acts and all they did—by what heroic endeavour or achievement did they make themselves 'conspicuous objects in a nation's eye?' How do you distinguish between Ira the Tekoite and Ira the Ithrite? was that famous for impetuous valour? and this for tactic? and Azmareth and Abi-albon, by what exploit did they vindicate a place to their names in a muster roll of mightiest captains? Of these men, 'the observed of all observers' in their generation, we know nothing but the names. Yet these are they under whose guidance the Israelites marched forth to assured conquest. These are they who filled the general ear with their reputation—who on returning from the battle-field to the Jewish capital, that ancient city lifted up her voice, and rent the skies in honour of these triumphant warriors. What the generals of our great captain are to us, household names to be had in reverence, these men were to the Hebrew people. Two thousand years hence, who shall know as much of the captains of our great Captain? or of the Marshalls of 'that modern mightier far,' the military Samson, (and blind too,) who laying hold of the pillars of the old social European structure brought it with 'smouldering ruin and combustion down' upon himself and the 'Lords of the Philistines.'"

Single-minded effort in the Master.

"Looking to him we can try ourselves whether we be working in the spirit of the master, all the doings of whose life come together, not into barren juxtaposition, but into homogeneous life—growing combination, the achievements of a lifetime resulting in a perfect work and a perfect character. Look to the master as he lives and acts before us in the evangelic portraiture. See how he adjusts every word and action to the advancement of his great mission. There is no division of his activity against itself; his thought and action are representative each of the other; every word and action of his flow from the common source of one grand idea; they roll on as many streams into the same great channel, and in their mighty confluence they bear down before them all obstructions. An effete exclusive Judaism, with its separative walls of partition dividing between man and man, he will overthrow, and he will build up an all-comprehending christian temple, wherein shall meet the men of all nations, each honouring the other as they who have been taught the doctrine of human brotherhood, and the worth of man in the *awful* height to which it was carried in the character of the Wonderful, 'the highest embodied possibility of human nature.' Follow him in all his journeyings whithersoever he goeth, from the hour when he entered on his mission to that when he said 'It is finished,' to see how a life of serene consistent endeavour for the good of man made him a great Captain of Salvation.

In his followers.

"Did Paul divide his strength between Judaism and Christianity? Did Luther, after he saw that the church would not reform itself, halt between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism? Did Howard oscillate between melioration and no melioration of prison discipline? Did Clarkson, after laying on the table of the House of Commons a petition against the slave trade, freight a ship with his fellow creatures? Were these men to be classed among the men of conventional equipoise, neither cold nor hot, giving ready good wishes to both sides, and effort to neither, or making a shew of doing two things, and therefore doing neither effectively. Let us take to one side with full purpose of and endeavour after unflinching adherence. Let us stand our ground, be the weather of the roughest, and so be as unlike as we can to migratory birds of passage that we can see on the wing from winter clime to summer climate, in quest of golden apples of the Hesperides, as if it were unknown that the fruit even of the tree of knowledge will, in the mouth of the dishonest seeker, burst into choking ashes."

This is no common volume. May we have another as short, as cheap, and as brilliant. We have no more room for extracts, but we direct the purchaser of the volume, and we hope there will be many such, to the fine passage p. 88, on the achievements of Christianity. We demur to the truth of one or two passing statements in the book, such as that p. 68, where it is said, "the best of the men of old strove to make the world better by the sword." Orpheus, Cadmus, Solon, Moses, Alfred, legislated, and if they countenanced the sword, it was from necessity, not the means they adopted whereby to make the world better.

III.—Be not Deceived.

This little volume which has been sent us we were doubtful for a time whether to notice or not. Not that we have been displeased with it, or that it is unworthy of notice, but because it treats on a class of subjects which has been so long conventionally suppressed, at least in decorous print, that we hesitated to give it additional publicity. It is, however, written in an earnest and solemn spirit—a young man's remonstrance with his fellow young men on very prevalent vices. It is to be feared that there are many, with whom it would be perfectly powerless, and again others, it is to be hoped, who would have here revealed to them states of mind, of which they had previously no conception. But generally we would say, that a parent could not put into the hands of a youth from perhaps sixteen to twenty-five years of age, exposed at a distance from home to the temptations of a large town, a more valuable treatise for the prevention of evil, than the one now under review. Much of the religious application of the punishments of futurity is immature, and more calculated to effect the mind just emerging from the popular faith, than one belonging to the class of Unitarians with which the author seems to be connected. Nevertheless there is much judicious matter in the appendix. The whole is a most serious and well-meant effort to do good, and though it certainly is not a book to be permitted to lie about, if placed by a discriminating judgment into the right hands, it cannot fail efficiently of its purpose. The composition is that of an unpractised writer, though developing germs of considerable power. The composer, whoever he may be, is a young man of talent; of a good and sound heart, imbued with religious principle, and though some parents might take alarm at the contents of the book, if they could see the heartless treatment which the subject receives in many treatises which fall into young men's hands, they would not be sorry to meet with one where it was handled, though freely, yet with deep moral feeling.

IV.—Letters and Papers by the late Theodosia Viscountess Powerscourt. Edited by the Rev. Robert Daly, A. M., Rector of Powerscourt in the Diocese of Dublin. Hatchard and Son. 1838.

The correspondence before us, has already passed through several editions, owing to the celebrity of the noble authoress and the talents with which the letters are written; which exhibit in powerful and original language the fervour of her piety and the strength of her genius. The Rev. editor, in his preface, declares that she possessed the strongest mind he ever recollected to have met in any woman; uniting uncommon masculine strength combined with the extremest feminine gentleness.

Her strong and original thoughts are occasionally highly poetical, though the imagery with which her style abounds sometimes borders upon the ludicrous. Her letters are, many of them, addressed to mourners, and these are peculiarly impressive and valuable. But that which we are particularly impressed with in reading the work of this celebrated lady is, the forcible and picturesque and daring manner in which she pictures forth at every turn those opinions, commonly called orthodox, which were the cherished portions of her creed. Never were the insurmountable contradictions and glaring incongruities of the popular belief more vividly displayed, and the whole body of this correspondence presents a mass of conglomerated confusion at once astonishing and melancholy.

That any person of masculine strength of mind and an intimate knowledge of scripture could so advocate and hold fast such opinions, would be totally inconceivable, did we not continually behold the unhappy fact.

A few passages, taken at hazard from the letters, will sufficiently shew the discrepancies and difficulties which occur in her views of God and Christ.

The great goodness of God in the sacrifice of his Son, and the glory of the Son as "God-man," are the two great topics with which her heart overflows; she perpetually declares that Jehovah and Jesus are one, but whenever she quotes the words of scripture she has to change her expressions, and dwells on the human nature with feelings of wonder and bewilderment.

Nothing can surely more endear to us our own simple and sublime interpretation of scripture doctrine than the perusal of remarks so awfully absurd and incomprehensible as the following:

> "What a mysterious subject is Jesus's knowledge as *man*. An inte-

resting subject! There is a knowledge he possesses from everlasting to everlasting, which has been ever perfect, admitting of no increase; but His knowledge as *man*, in which He grew as He grew in years, by which he 'knows his sheep,' implies love. Love brought him into our school, led Him through every class in that school. Love educated Him into the knowledge of death and the grave."—p. 124.

"I believe in Peter's denial, He felt his ingratitude, *as man;* and the abhorrence of his sin, *as God.*"—p. 121.

"Jesus *learned God to perfection.* Jesus *learned man to perfection.*" —p. 291.

"Dependence and submission seemed a new happiness obtained by our blessed Master as a man. Not only did He submit to His Father, but see how He leaned on his brethren."—p. 234.

"It was doubtless a new pleasure Jesus learnt as a creature."—p. 190.

"The sacrifice of God in slaying his Son, was the utmost pang the Divine Mind could devise."—p. 204.

"Satan has defaced our God from his creation; therefore, in it destroyed our enjoyment. Nothing but resurrection is worthy the gift of a God. The things of the world, and the things of the Kingdom, must be for ever and absolutely distinct. One, of Satan the God of this world; the other, of the Father; *the reward he has prepared for his Son, proportioned to his sense of merit in the work of his Son;* risen Lord of a risen creation."—p. 191.

"One with our elder Brother, in all his sufferings and privileges." —p. 227.

"The heart of Jesus is a filial heart."—p. 185.

"You possess God. He is a jealous God. He says, 'how can I give it up, my Temple, my portion? I have put thee among the children, I have betrothed thee to my Son, I have whispered, I am thy great salvation—when desponding I have whispered, *I am Jesus.*' * * * * * Is this the answer of faith to Him who spared not his only Son, but gave him up for you? Is it not unkind; does it not grieve him? *He has a human heart*!"—p. 221.

"Has the infinite space between God and the sinner been filled by *Himself?* Has He really taken bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh, to enable him to stand in the gap? And does he now put himself in the attitude of a begger, to implore sinners to be reconciled to Him? Yes! He has valued us at the price of His own precious blood. It is no more with us; is God angry with *us*? But is He angry with *his Son?* Not, shall He condemn *me*; but shall He condemn my surety? Not, shall any abomination and ingratitude pluck *me* out of His hand, but shall it pluck Jesus?"

"If the Millennial reign of Christ be a particular reward to Him for his sufferings as Son of man, distinct from the everlasting glory, those only who have partaken with Him shall reign with Him."—p. 153.

"*How refreshing,* in the middle of so many proofs of His Godhead (Luke, 5th Chap.) to find him withdrawing into the wilderness to pray." —p. 165.

"He was educated and disciplined in every thing. Taught by the

Spirit; led by the path of faith. We have an interest in his person, as well as in his office. We must live in God, inhale his breath; for, like the sun we can only know Him by his own influences proceeding from Himself."—p. 133.

"Was not the glorified body of Jesus standing at the right hand of God in the light of the Highest, when the apostle declared, our vile bodies shall be fashioned like to His glorious body?"—p. 126.

INTELLIGENCE.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

The anniversary of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association was held on Wednesday the 17th of June in Essex street Chapel, when after the reading of the introductory service by the Rev. Edward Tagart, a most interesting and admirable discourse was delivered by the Rev. Samuel Bache of Birmingham, from Ephes. iv. and part of the 15th verse. "Speaking the truth in love." The design of the preacher was to exhibit the essential union of integrity and charity in the maintenance of Christian truth. After having noticed in his introduction the extensive prevalence of the opinion that they are irreconcilable, and the violations of both consequent upon this prevalent opinion, he proceeded to establish the identity of truth, as an object of human attainment with individual conviction, and to urge upon every man the duty of consistently maintaining what he really believed to be true. He dwelt much upon the importance of this duty, and insisted that the fulfilment of it should be respected by every individual in the case of others as well as of himself; in other words, that the claims of truth and charity are reciprocal and equal.

In his application of these general principles to the circumstances of Unitarian Christians, the preacher protested equally against evasion, compromise and insincerity in the public worship of God on the one hand, and against the imposition of speculative and formal restrictions on those who desire to unite as Christians in the offices of devotion on the other. He showed that the exertions of Unitarian Christians for the recommendation of their distinguishing sentiments must needs be restricted by many considerations which could have no force with Christians of other sects, and that they must often be content to relinquish many of the most splendid trophies of party triumph as did the great Apostle of the Gentiles in his days,—that they had nevertheless a solid ground of hope on which they might fearlessly take their stand, and look with confidence to the future.

He observed, in conclusion, that the increasing stringency of many methods which are now adopted for the revival of antiquated creeds and claims is but the measure of the increasing expansive power of the spirit of freedom, and an encouragement, therefore, to fidelity and perseverance on the part of all who believe, as Unitarian Christians must, that they are peculiarly in possession of much important truth, and of the elements of much more. The Sermon, though long, was not, we believe, felt to be so by the hearers, but was listened to with marked attention, and excited a general desire for its publication. At the business meeting which succeeded the close of the religious service, James Heywood, Esq. was called to the chair. The Report of the Committee was read by the Secretary, the Rev. Robert Aspland, and was prefaced by a few congratulatory remarks on the happy deliverance of our beloved Queen from the danger that had lately threatened her valuable life. Reference was then made to the severe and heavy loss sustained by the Society during the past year in the death of some of its most esteemed and cherished members—particularly of Edgar Taylor, Esq., many years solicitor to the association, and in various ways its benefactor and friend; and also of the Rev. Dr. Carpenter, whose life and character was regarded by the whole Unitarian body as reflecting honour and credit upon the community to which he belonged. After mentioning two or three handsome bequests which had lately been made to the Association, and sundry grants of money and books to various Congregations in England and Wales, the Report proceeded to notice the abandonment of the Madras mission. This resolution, it was stated, had not been come to by the Committee without the fullest and most anxious consideration of all the circumstances connected with the case. After the death of William Roberts, and the inquiries to which it led, they felt satisfied that the mission could no longer be conducted in a manner at all answerable to their wishes, or with expectations of success in any degree commensurate with the great expense of carrying it on. Some alterations were proposed and adopted in respect to the constitution and management of the Association. The number of the Committee was reduced; and for the sake of greater unity and simplicity in the conduct of the business, one Secretary was chosen instead of three. Thanks were then voted to Mr. Bache for his able and excellent discourse,—a resolution which was not passed without manifestations of the most cordial and hearty concurrence on the part of all present.

From the Chapel the company withdrew about three o'clock to the Crown and Anchor tavern in the Strand, where a dejeuner was provided both for Ladies and Gentlemen. The number assembled amounted to about three hundred. John Taylor, Esq. was called to the Chair, and as long as he remained discharged its duties with much satisfaction to those who were present. When Mr. Taylor quitted the Chair his place was supplied, and it need not be said how well supplied, by Mr. Aspland. Various sentiments, according with the object of the meeting, were given from the Chair, and were responded to in animated addresses from several of the gentlemen present. A burst of enthusiastic applause followed the mention of the Queen's name, and the national anthem was sung with great spirit and fervour. The appearance of Mr. Aspland, after his absence on several former occasions on account of ill health, was hailed with acclamation and delight. A glow of sincere satisfaction and pleasure seemed to animate every countenance when he rose to speak, and happy indeed are we to say, that he spoke with all his accustomed readiness and vigour, and to the high gratification of all who listened to him. Altogether the meeting was one of considerable interest. A spirit of harmony and cordiality prevailed throughout. The presence of the Ladies afforded the highest satisfaction, and produced a general conviction that upon such occasions in future it cannot and must not be dispensed with.

LONDON DOMESTIC MISSION SOCIETY.

The fifth annual meeting of this Society took place on Thursday, May 14th, at Carter Lane Chapel: it began with divine service. The Scriptures were read, and the prayer offered by the Rev. Dr. Hutton. The sermon was preached by the Rev. W. Hincks, from Matt. xi. 5, "The poor have the gospel preached to them." The preacher, in a clear and energetic discourse, pointed out the duty of striving to enlighten and exalt the labouring classes; and expressed his firm conviction, that the Unitarian body of London and its neighbourhood would not fail to do their part in this sacred work, by liberally supporting an institution so admirably fitted for the purpose.

After the service, James Heywood, Esq., was called to the chair, and the reports were read. From the treasurer's report it appeared that on December 31, 1839, there was a balance in hand of £50. 2*s.* 5*d.*, but that the outstanding engagements of the Society were from £90. to £100., and that £62. 3*s.* 10*d.* were due to the poor's purse, thus showing a deficiency of upwards of £100. upon the year's account. Between £60. and £70. of this, however, were for disbursements of the year 1838, thus reducing the actual deficiency of the year to about £50. This will also appear by another mode of stating the account: Total receipts for 1839, for general purposes, £405. 17*s.* 7*d.*; actual expenditure, £351. 1*s.* 8*d.*; outstanding engagements from £90. to £100.

On this statement, the Committee's Report founded an earnest appeal for increased support, urging on the attention of the meeting that unless this were given, some portion of the valuable operations of the Society must be given up. Subsequently, there was some discussion as to the propriety of drawing more largely on the Unitarian public; but the general feeling of the meeting evidently was, that efforts should be made to prevent the necessity of any narrowing of the field of labour, especially when it was clearly understood that the current expenses of the year exceeded the current income by no overwhelming amount; and the following resolution was passed:—

"That this meeting recommends to the Committee to take the state of the finances into its earliest consideration; and expresses its conviction of the importance of prompt, renewed, and extended efforts to prevent the necessity of contracting the present operations of the Society."

The report, with regard to the labours of the missionaries, the state of the schools, classes, mutual instruction societies, &c., was very favourable. The missionaries' reports to the Committee furnished much interesting and important matter, which was freely made use of, and excited an earnest attention in the meeting. For the particulars, the reader is referred to the printed report, which may be had on application at the booksellers.

In the course of the proceedings a respectful tribute was paid to the memory of the late and lamented Dr. Carpenter, so justly venerated, and whose labours will so long survive, monuments of his untiring energy, zeal, and benevolence. A resolution was moved by the Rev.

Dr. Hutton, and seconded by the Rev. B. Mardon, which was received with that silently cordial feeling which befitted the occasion.

"That this meeting, remembering the deep interest taken in domestic missions by the late Rev. Dr. Carpenter, and his generous zeal for the promotion of this mission in particular, desires to express to his mourning family its sympathy in their bereavement, and its earnest wishes that the consolation and support of God's Holy Spirit may be with their hearts."

The remaining resolutions, necessary to the business of the Society, were unanimously passed; and the meeting closed after the announcement of sundry donations, subscriptions, congregational collections at Little Portland Street and Worship Street, and a collection at the doors of the chapel on the present occasion, amounting altogether to upwards of £100.: thus proving, in a most satisfactory manner, that the Society had, at least, the warm sympathy of that meeting.

In the evening a tea meeting was held at Spicer Street, which was well attended, but not so numerously as on some former occasions. The arrangements were most neat, orderly, and pleasant; and the tables ornamented with several bouquets of flowers. After tea, Thomas Hornby, Esq., one of the founders of the Society, was called to the chair, and the following sentiments were proposed by Mr. Surridge, Rev. E. Chapman, Mr. Wansey, Rev. W. Hincks, Mr. Mason, and Rev. B. Mardon:—

1. The Improvement of the Human Race.
2. The London Domestic Mission Society, an instrument of human improvement.
3. Our Missionaries.

This was responded to by Mr. Philp and Mr. Vidler, in two interesting speeches, bearing reference to their labours, their hopes, and prospects.

4. Those who have seconded the Labours of the Missionaries in the Day, Evening, and Sunday Schools.
5. Prosperity to the Mutual Instruction Societies.

This was given by Mr. Mason, a member of the Mutual Instruction Society at Spicer Street, with a neat and appropriate speech, in which he stated that he owed everything which he most valued to his having joined that society; and spoke of his connection with the Sunday School as one of the happiest circumstances of his life.

6. The Friends of the Institution present and absent.

In the course of the evening, the children of the singing-class sang several of the excellent airs in Hickson's "Singing Master."

Between £8. and £9. were collected at the door.

SUNDAY-SCHOOL ASSOCIATION.

The Sixth Annual Meeting of this Association took place at Radley's Hotel, Bridge Street, Blackfriars, on Wednesday, June 10, the Rev. D. Davison, in the chair. Upwards of eighty persons sat down to breakfast, being a larger number than has assembled on any previous occasion.

After an excellent address from the Chairman, the Secretary, the Rev. E. Chapman read the report, which contained much interesting matter from the different schools in connexion with the association, showing that, for the most part, they are in a flourishing condition, conducted with much zeal, spirit, and ability, and, as far as can be judged, likely to effect much good among those for whose benefit they have been instituted.

Eight schools have joined the association since the last report; and one, hitherto in connexion with the Society, has been lately discontinued. Reports have been received from twenty-three schools. For a condensed statement of their contents the reader is referred to the forthcoming report of the association, which may be had on application to Mr. J. Green, 121, Newgate Street, the Agent and Depository of the Society.

Together with the necessary resolutions of business, the following resolution was moved by the Rev. J. C. Means, seconded by the Rev. B. Mardon, and supported by the Rev. Dr. Hutton, and the unanimous feeling of those assembled:—

"That this meeting desires to express its deep and heartfelt respect for the memory of the late Drs. Carpenter and Tuckerman, men whose Christian piety and varied excellence entitle them to be held in enduring remembrance, and whose kind and valued co-operation in the formation of this Society calls for special notice on the present occasion."

The meeting was throughout very pleasant in its spirit, and broke up in evident satisfaction with the proceedings of the morning. There is good reason to hope that it will not be ineffectual in promoting the great and good work of Sunday School instruction.

THE
CHRISTIAN TEACHER.

Art. I.—THE NATURE AND DESIGN OF CHRISTIANITY INVESTIGATED FROM AN ANALYSIS OF ITS PRIMITIVE RECORDS, CONTAINED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

No. III.—The Apostolic Mission delineated in the Book of Acts.

I.

The book which we now proceed to examine, forms the second part of a general treatise on the origin and earliest propagation of Christianity, of which the Gospel of Luke constitutes the first.* Both works bear strong internal traces of having proceeded from the same hand; they are constructed upon one plan, and out of similar materials. By the general consent of antiquity, they have been ascribed to Luke, the supposed companion of Paul during his missionary journies. Of this Luke, who is not once mentioned by name in the Acts of the Apostles, only a very few incidental notices occur in the other parts of the New Testament.† It is probable, that he was by birth a heathen: Eusebius and Jerome represent him as a native of Antioch.

From several passages in the Book of Acts, in which the use of the first person plural is suddenly introduced, and then as suddenly withdrawn, it has been inferred, that we possess—at least in these passages—the direct testimony of the author, as an eye-witness, to the truth of the facts which he there records. But when we consider the account given by Luke himself, in the preface to his Gospel, of the sources from which he gathered the materials of his work, intended, as he says, immediately for the instruction of Theophilus in the historical grounds of his faith*—and when we further notice the curious circumstance, that this use of the first person plural occurs only in three passages of the Acts of the Apostles, in each of which the particulars of a voyage, with the events immediately preceding and following it, form the principal subject of the relation†—we are rather brought to the conclusion, which an analysis of the general structure of this Apostolic history confirms, that the author has wrought into his narrative various separate memorials of which he had obtained possession, and that in the passages particularly referred to, we have perhaps extracts from a journal kept during the time by some companion of the apostle. But that that companion was certainly Luke himself is more than the internal evidence of the history warrants us to infer.

---

* Τὸν πρῶτον λόγον. Act. Apost. i. 1.

† Coloss. iv. 14. (where he is described as "the beloved physician.") 2 Tim. iv. 11. Philemon 24.

The disjointed and irregular manner in which the several narratives of the Acts of the Apostles follow each other, and the general absence of all clear and definite chronological data, justify the opinion, that we possess indeed in this very interesting work, a precious collection of the most valuable original documents, but perhaps—as tried by the severer standard of modern criticism—rather the *materials* for history than a history itself.* The Acts of the Apostles may be regarded as the commencement of Ecclesiastical History: a right conception of the facts, the principles and the tendencies which it makes known to us, is indispensable to our appreciating with intelligence and impartiality the ensuing historical development of Christianity and the Church. In this paper I shall first briefly exhibit an analysis of the contents of the Acts of the Apostles; and shall then deduce from them, when thus placed fully before us, the results to which they lead, and the conclusions which they appear to justify.

---

* *ἵνα ἐπιγνῷς περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων τὴν ἀσφάλειαν*, i. 4.

† These passages are the following: Acts xvi. 10—17, in the description of Paul's second missionary journey, when the vision appeared to him at Troas, directing him to go over into Macedonia; here, without any warning to the reader, the narrative suddenly changes to the use of the first person plural, and retains it through the particulars of the voyage from Troas to Neapolis, till the arrival at Philippi, which may be considered as the proper limit to the voyage, though some miles distant from the coast; at v. 17, after the account of some transactions at Philippi, the narrative resumes its previous form: Acts xx. 5—15, xxi. 1—17, contains the particulars of Paul's voyage from Philippi to Ptolemais, on his return from his last missionary journey in Greece and Asia; the use of the first person plural terminates here with the arrival at Jerusalem, as in the former passage at Philippi; it is introduced very abruptly xx. 5, is intermitted from v. 17 to the end of ch. xx., during the account of Paul's separation from the ship and his last interview with the elders from Ephesus, and is taken up as abruptly again at the commencement of ch. xxi.: Acts xxvii—xxviii. 16, this again is a minute and circumstantial account of the voyage from Cæsarea to Italy, terminating all at once with the arrival at Rome, as if the journal from which it is taken, broke off suddenly at that point. The fact that the use of the first person plural occurs only in connexion with these three accounts of a sea-voyage is a peculiarity which must of course have struck other readers of the Acts, but which I do not remember to have seen any where expressly noticed. The language in these passages has frequently the picturesque character which naturally accompanies an immediate record of the impressions of an eye-witness; for example, ch. xxi. 3, *ἀναφανέντες δὲ τὴν Κύπρον, καὶ καταλιπόντες αὐτὴν εὐώνυμον*, &c. The indications of time, xx. 6, and xxvii. 9, imply that the writer was of Jewish origin; this has been remarked by De Wette (*Einleit. in N. T.* § 114, c.), as inconsistent with the supposition that it could be Luke, who is generally regarded as a convert from heathenism. It may be further observed, that he appears familiar with the use of nautical phrases, many of which occur in these narratives: e. g., *εὐθυδρομήσαντες, ἀνήχθημεν, κατήχθημεν, ὑπεπλεύσαμεν τὴν Κύπρον* (kept to the *leeward* of Cyprus), *παρελέγοντο, ὑποζωννύντες τὸ πλοῖον, χαλάσαντες τὸ σκεῦος, βολίσαντες εὗρον ὀργυιὰς, ἀγκύρας περιελόντες, ἀνέντες τὰς ζευκτηρίας τῶν πηδαλίων, ἐπάραντες τὸν ἀρτέμονα.*

II.

1. (Ch. i.) The commencement of the Acts joins on with the concluding narrative of the Gospel of Luke: with the terminations of the other three Evangelists it does not exactly harmonise. According to Luke (xxiv. 49), the apostles were directed by the risen Jesus to remain in Jerusalem, till they were "endued with power from on high;" the same command is repeated Acts i. 4: whereas in Matthew and Mark the last interviews between Christ and his disciples are represented to have taken place in Galilee. For forty days after his passion he is here said to have visibly manifested himself by many signs to his apostles, discoursing with them of the kingdom of God, checking their impatient curiosity about the future, and assuring them that the baptism of the holy Spirit would qualify them to become witnesses to him in Jerusalem, Judæa and Samaria, and to the ends of the earth. To the circumstances of the ascension described in the Gospel, the simple addition is made by the Acts of "a cloud receiving him out of their

---

* *Dr. Benson* observes (*Paraphrase and Notes on* 2 *Tim. iv.* 11), "I look upon the second part of St. Luke's history (which is commonly called the Acts of the Apostles) to have been only designed as *a compendious account* of what the Apostles preached, first to the *Jews*, then to the *devout*, and afterwards to the *idolatrous Gentiles*: and that the author reckoned, when he had given a specimen of the doctrine which the apostles preached, and the method they took, and had intimated something of the success which they met with,—among each of these three sorts of persons,—he had finished his design."

The order of events here indicated corresponds to a certain extent with the successive developments of Christianity recorded in the Book of Acts: but the notion of *system* in every thing relating to theology, so prevalent in Dr. Benson's time, seems to have led the excellent author to assume the necessity of a greater uniformity of plan in the composition of this work, than an analysis of its contents will be found to justify. An application to the Acts of the Apostles of the same analytical principles which Schleiermacher has employed with so much sagacity on the Gospel of Luke, would be a very useful labour, and might furnish some important results. The inquiry in the text is only designed to bring out, in a popular way, the more obvious and prominent features of the narrative.

sight."[*] The two men "in white apparel," who appeared to the wondering apostles on this occasion, are evidently the same that are spoken of by Luke "in shining garments." Matthew and Mark describe only one angel. The account in John (xx. 12), of "two angels in white sitting" in the sepulchre, has in this case a closer affinity with the narration, obviously identical, in Luke and the Acts.

The "upper room" to which they return from Mount Olivet, is the same with the "large upper room furnished," (Luke xxii. 12,) which Peter and John were directed to "make ready," for the eating of the Passover.[†] These minute coincidences sufficiently prove that the book of Acts is only a continuation of the narrative commenced in Luke; and that in these two books we must look, in the first instance, for the evidences of consistency between the history of Christ and that of the apostles. This remark admits of further application. The eleven apostles here enumerated are the same as those mentioned in Luke (vi. 14—16); only the order of arrangement is different. In Matthew (x. 2—4), "Lebbæus surnamed Thaddæus" takes the place of "Judas the brother of James." The account of the fate of Judas differs from that given by Matthew. Matthew (xxvi. 14—16) speaks of Judas bargaining with the Chief Priests for thirty pieces of silver; and then adds (xxvii. 3—10, a narrative peculiar to himself, and to which there is nothing parallel in the other Evangelists), that when Judas saw Jesus condemned, he repented and restored the money to the Priests, who not venturing to put it into the treasury, purchased with it the "potter's field to bury strangers in," which was ever afterwards called the "field of blood." In this transaction Matthew (xxvii. 9) finds the fulfilment of a prophecy of Jeremiah.[‡] Mark (xiv. 11) and Luke (xxii. 5, 6) simply state, that Judas agreed with the Priests for silver, not specifying, like Matthew, the exact sum. The account in Acts is consistent with, and a continuation of, that contained in Luke. It is more unfavourable to Judas than any other account; and gives a different explanation of the origin of the name *Aceldama, i. e.* "field of blood." Matthew says, Judas was impelled by remorse to destroy himself; Luke, on the contrary, that he purchased a piece of land with the price of his treachery, and perished by an accident which occurred to him there, and which gave the field its subsequent appellation. When Luke adds, "this was known to all the dwellers at Jerusalem," it is not quite clear, whether these words, occurring as they do between the two clauses, must necessarily be referred to the fate of Judas, or simply to the fact of the field's being called, in the dialect of the country, Aceldama.[*]

---

[*] Luke xxiv. 51.—*διέστη ἀπ' αὐτῶν, καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν.* Acts i. 9.—*νεφέλη ὑπέλαβεν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν.*

[†] Acts i. 13.—*τὸ ὑπερῷον.* Luke xxii. 12.—*ἀνάγαιον μέγα ἐστρωμένον.*

[‡] No such passage as is here quoted by Matthew occurs in the now extant oracles of that prophet. One similar to it is found in Zechariah (xi. 12, 13). The attempts of the critics to explain this difficulty may be seen in Kuinoel's note on the passage in Matthew. There is no critical authority whatever for an alteration of the reading.

The number of disciples assembled in Jerusalem at the time of the ascension is stated to have been a hundred and twenty, and among them, it is to be observed, are expressly mentioned the mother and the brethren of Jesus (i. 14); and they are described as continuing "*with one accord*,[†] in prayer and supplication." Their first business on meeting was to fill up the vacancy in the number of the apostles occasioned by the desertion of Judas. The qualifications and office of an apostle are very distinctly defined (i. 22); he must have attended the public ministry of Jesus from his baptism to his ascension; and his office was to bear witness to the resurrection of Christ. Two individuals thus qualified were selected from the disciples; and the choice between them, after prayer, was determined by lot. Matthias was the new apostle.[‡]

2. (ii.) The next section of the narrative forms the proper commencement of the apostolic period. The events recorded in it mark a broad line of separation between the history of the Gospel and that of the Acts: from this time forth, the views and conduct of the apostles assume a new character. Three circumstances require especial notice:—the descent of the spirit; Peter's speech; and the effect of the whole transaction upon the state of the Church.

---

[*] Three facts may be inferred from these several accounts of the fate of Judas: 1. That in the age when the earliest historical memorials of Christianity originated, there was a piece of ground adjoining Jerusalem, called Aceldama and also "the potter's field," which was set apart by the national prejudice of the Jews for the interment of strangers (*ξένοις*, *i.e.* not Jews (comp. 3 John 5), though Grotius, Matt. xxvii. 7, thinks otherwise); 2. That this spot of evil omen was associated in the tradition of the primitive Christians with the conduct and fate of the detested betrayer of Jesus, the tradition taking one form in the account followed by Matthew, and another in that which has been preserved by Luke; 3. That the Christians of that age were confirmed in this association of the person and the place, by applying to it different passages of the Hebrew Scriptures, Matthew quoting Zechariah, and Luke (Acts i. 20) the Psalms (lxviii. 25, Septuag. and cviii. 8, Septuag.).

[†] *ὁμοθυμαδὸν.*

[‡] The language of Peter respecting Judas (i. 25), *πορευθῆναι εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν ἴδιον*, has been variously interpreted. See Kuinoel *in loc*. The most obvious meaning seems to be, "to the place assigned him in the future receptacle of the wicked." Perhaps a notion is implied, that Gehenna was divided, to meet various degrees of wickedness, in a manner corresponding to the many mansions (*μοναὶ πολλαί*, John xiv. 2) of the virtuous in God's house. Wetstein and Kuinoel quote a passage from Ignatius *ad Magnes*. 5, where the very same expression occurs, with a similar reference; *ἕκαστος εἰς τὸν ἴδιον τόπον μέλλει χωρεῖν.*

On the day of Pentecost—when the forty days of Christ's visible manifestation on earth between the resurrection and the ascension (i. 3) were elapsed—the house where the disciples were assembled was suddenly filled with a violent rushing wind; tongues as of fire settled upon each of them; under the influence of the spirit, they began to speak in the various languages of the foreign Jews then residing in Jerusalem; and the bystanders, witnessing these extraordinary effects, ascribed them to intoxication. Upon each of these statements we may remark, that the feast of Pentecost, at which the first great outpouring of the Spirit upon those who were to carry Christianity into all lands, is here represented to have taken place—was traditionally associated by the Jews with the season of the original promulgation of the Law on Mount Sinai; that the appearance of the tongues of fire,* whatever it may have been, and which seems to be connected with the spiritual gifts spoken of by Paul (1 Cor. xii. xiii. xiv.), was an indication of the presence of the spirit and of the reality of its operation, symbolised here under that particular form, as at the baptism of Christ by the descent of a dove; that the various nations enumerated in this passage indicate the then existing extent of Jewish colonization; and that in the synagogues of these remote colonies, around which numerous proselytes gathered themselves, the Hebrew Scriptures were interpreted every Sabbath-day into the language habitually used by the worshippers; and, lastly, that, when the new spirit of Christianity diffused itself into these more distant settlements, the texts expressive of the Messianic hopes would naturally suggest themselves in that language to the remembrance of the convert, and be by him poured forth, in the religious meetings of the brethren, in a strain of rapturous enthusiasm, more indicative of the fervour of his own belief than conducing to the edification of others, which not unnaturally excited the ridicule of those whose hearts were yet untouched by the spreading faith.†

---

* In this account of the confusion of tongues, accompanying the earliest dispersion of Christianity, has the mind of the writer been influenced by any reference to the story of Babel in Genesis (xi.)? Such parallelisms between the old dispensation and the new readily suggested themselves to the mind of a Jewish Christian. The earlier part of Acts has evidently been composed out of Jewish materials.

† On the subject of the "Tongues" in the apostolic age, much difference of opinion has existed, and much research and speculation been bestowed—more, however, on the Continent than in our own country. *Mr. Locke*, in his Commentary (1 Cor. xii—xiv), has evaded the expression of any decided opinion. The principal views that I am acquainted with, are the following: 1. *Dr. Conyers Middleton* (*Essay on the Gift of Tongues.* Works, II. 4to. iii,) restricts himself to a *negative* view, opposed to the prevalent orthodoxy of his day; and simply shows, that this gift did not confer a perpetual knowledge of foreign languages (since the contrary is proved by the

Combining these several views, may we not infer, that in the wide dispersion and awakening influence of the spirit of the Gospel—which was the going forth of a new law among men, by which the eyes of their minds were opened to the true meaning of their ancient prophecies,—and to the inspirations of which they gave utterance, " every man in their own tongue, wherein they were born"—we discover the general historical fact, which lies at the basis of these representations in the book of Acts, and the expression of which has been condensed into this symbolical form? Reduced to its historical significance, the purport of the passage amounts to this; the obscure movement of a Galilæan peasant (ii. 7) has set in motion the tongues of the whole civilised world. That the gift of tongues did not imply the permanent miracle of speaking foreign languages, as the occasion might require, is evident from the sequel of the history; and indeed the intercourse then subsisting between all the provinces of the Roman empire, and the general acquaintance of all classes, not excluding the very lowest, in the towns,

apostolic history, and by the defective character of the language of the New Testament itself), but was intended merely as a manifestation, for the time being, of the Spirit of God. The same view is briefly expressed by *Wetstein* in a note on 1 Cor. xiv. 13. 2. *Eichhorn* (*Kuinoel on Acts* ii. 4) makes a distinction between γλώσσῃ and γλώσσαις λαλεῖν (1 Cor. xiv.) and the λαλεῖν ἑτέραις γλώσσαις (Acts ii. 4); the former he interprets of the enthusiastic utterance of unintelligible sounds; the latter of the employment of their different languages by the Christians assembled at Jerusalem. 3. *Herder* (*Kuinoel in loc.*), proceeding on the opinion that the word γλῶσσα is used on certain occasions to express rare and obsolete forms of speech, explains the phrases, used in Acts and 1 Cor., of speaking in an inspired and enthusiastic manner, and giving new interpretations of the divine oracles; and by τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ ἤκουον he understands the recognition by the hearers of their own feelings and expectations in these extraordinary words. 4. *Professor Bleek of Bonn* renewed the discussion (*Theolog. Stud. und Krit.*, 1829), and undertook to show that the γλῶσσαι were highly enthusiastic and poetical forms of expression, giving utterance to excited religious feeling, and requiring conversion into the plainer language of ordinary life. 5. *Dr. Schulz of Breslau* (*Theol. Stud. und Krit.*, 1839, pp. 752—778) regards the γλῶσσαι as exclamations of joy and thanksgiving—hosannahs, proceeding from the depth of the heart. 6. *Wieseler of Göttingen* (*Theol. Stud. und Krit.*, 1839, pp. 703—775) takes a different view; according to him, the γλῶσσαι were low unintelligible moanings—also indications of religious excitement—which the parties uttering them could alone afterwards interpret. There seems no ground for the refined distinction which he attempts to establish—that under the three forms of expression, ἑτέραις γλώσσαις λαλεῖν, γλώσσ. λαλ., and καιναῖς γλώσσ. λαλ., we are to understand a reference respectively to the Jewish Christians of Palestine, to the Christians speaking Greek, and to the Roman or Latin Christians. 7. *Dr. Baur of Tubingen* (*Theol. Stud. und Krit.*, 1839, pp. 618—703) considers the γλῶσσαι to have been unusual and fragmentary expressions of a religious nature, taken from different languages, and not universally intelligible; which, being poured out in the excitement of the moment, required subsequent interpretation. He supposes the earliest account of this χάρισμα to be contained in 1 Cor. xii. xiv., and that from this point of view, we must proceed to the interpretation of the narrative in Acts. Between the two accounts in 1 Cor. and in Acts, Baur conceives there is all the difference between the simple statement of a primitive fact, and the symbolical conception of it under traditional influences at a later date.

with the Greek language, would have rendered such a miracle nearly superfluous.

In the speech of Peter, the chief points to be noticed are,—the application of the passage from Joel, foretelling the effusion of the spirit in the last days, to the present circumstances of the believers,—the allusion to the crucifixion of Jesus, as having happened through "the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God," probably with a view to remove the ignominious character of the event,—the description of Jesus as "a man approved of God by miracles and signs and wonders,"—the assertion of his being "raised to the right hand of God," "having received the holy Spirit," and being the cause of its present effusion,—and the setting of him forth, in his now risen and glorified state, under the character which he henceforth uniformly retains, of Lord and Christ. These declarations are confirmed by the application of various passages of the Psalms, which, it would appear, from the mode of their quotation, were then generally interpreted of David.

A deep sensation is produced by this address. The hearers are exhorted to *repent* and be *baptized*, that they may receive the *remission of their sins* and the gift of the *holy spirit*. A great increase of believers takes place. Three thousand are added to the Church in one day. The general condition of the society is vividly described in the concluding verses of the chapter: its distinguishing features are—the wonders wrought by the apostles,—the relinquishment of private property, and the having all things in common,—the harmony of the believers,—their entire devotion to the offices of public prayer, and the celebration of the commemorative feast from house to house,—the popularity and great success of the apostolic labours.

3. (iii.—iv. 35.) The apostolic history, on which we have now fairly entered, contained in the remainder of the book of Acts,—admits of a division into two principal sections; one of which records the labours of John and Peter—chiefly the latter apostle—and the extension of the properly Jewish Church;—the other, the origin and development of a more enlarged conception of Christianity, which made its way among the heathen, and was carried out into the world by the ministry of a new apostle—Paul. Each of these sections naturally resolves itself into smaller subdivisions, of which we shall briefly exhibit the contents, and attempt to mark the mutual relations,—simply noticing, when it occurs, the transition from the Jewish to the Gentile period of the history.

In the course of their ministrations, Peter and John heal a lame man at the Beautiful Gate of the temple. They disclaim all power of their own, and ascribe the cure to the efficacy of the name of Jesus. Peter calls the attention of the astonished multitude to the chief topics of Christian preaching;—Christ's death, by the hands of those who were ignorant of what they did; his resurrection, as the commencer of a new life;[*] his remaining in heaven till the "times of refreshing and the restitution of all things come,"[†] when he shall descend on earth to commence the future age foretold by the prophets; the necessity of repentance, conversion, and the remission of sins; Christ, the prophet announced by Moses, sent by God to prepare men for approaching events, by turning them away from their iniquities.

While teaching the people in the temple, the apostles are taken into custody by the commander of the sacerdotal guard, at the instance of the Sadducees, who dislike their doctrine, and are afraid of their popularity. On the morrow, they are brought before the council, and vindicate their conduct with much boldness. Fearful of exciting the people, the High Priest's party dismiss them, with a simple prohibition from preaching again. Returned to their friends, they offer up a fervent prayer of thanksgiving and confidence, in which the sentiment is again expressed, that every thing had happened to Jesus by the will and foreknowledge of God; and in answer to this prayer, a first descent of the Spirit is visibly manifested among them, by the influence of which they are inspired to speak the word with all boldness.

The passage from v. 32 to v. 35, iv., contains a sort of summary or general winding up of the foregoing narrative, and forms a natural conclusion to it. It is a beautiful description of the condition of the infant Church; little more, however, than an amplified repetition of the statement which terminates the second chapter. In the community of goods, which prevailed among the earliest believers, we seem to see a literal compliance with Christ's injunction (Luke xviii. 22); "sell all that thou hast, and distribute unto the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven."

The whole of the preceding relation (iii.—iv. 35) bears strong internal traces of a Hebrew origin. The prayer (iv. 24—31) is quite Jewish. Every reader of the original at once recognizes the Hebraism [‡] (iv. 17); and the favourite phrases, *ὁμοϑυμαδόν*, *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ*, are evidently translations from the Hebrew, and frequently occur in the Septuagint and Apocrypha.[§]

---

[*] *τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς ζωῆς*, iii. 15.

[†] *καιροὶ ἀναψύξεως—χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων*, iii. 19, 21.

[‡] *ἀπειλῇ ἀπειλησώμεθα.*

[§] See *Trommii Concordant. in voc.*

4. iv. 36—v. 16. seems to form a narrative by itself, illustrative of the special providence which was exercised over the incipient church and intended to uphold the peculiar constitution of its affairs. It is an expansion and exemplification of the general statement (ii. 43); "fear came upon every soul: and many wonders and signs were done by the apostles." Barnabas, a Cyprian Levite, sells an estate and deposits the price with the apostles. In the case of Ananias and Sapphira, it is to be observed, that Peter pronounces no sentence of death, but the judgment is represented as proceeding immediately from God. This story is told completely in the manner of the Old Testament. The expressions *οἱ νεώτεροι* (v. 6.) and *οἱ νεανίσκοι* (v. 10.) are altogether Jewish,[*] but occur only once elsewhere in the historical books of the New Testament. V. 12—16 is a general statement of the miraculous operations of the apostles. Their usual place of resort was the Temple, in Solomon's porch: the same spot was frequented by Jesus. (John x. 22.) The miracles described are of the same healing and beneficent kind with those that were wrought by Jesus. One circumstance deserves notice from its singularity; the sick were laid where "the shadow of Peter passing by might overshadow some of them." A similar enthusiastic confidence we shall see hereafter manifested towards the person of Paul.[†] A divine influence flowed also from the body of Christ: numbers that only touched the hem of his garment were healed.[‡]

5. (v. 17—42.) Of this division the passage from v. 17 to v. 33 contains an account of transactions almost identical with those recorded iv. 1—23, with the simple addition of the miraculous deliverance of the apostles from prison.[§] In this, as in the former case, the Sadducees were the movers of the persecution. It is a circumstance entitled to much notice, as indicating the state of parties among the Jews at this juncture, that this movement of the Sadducees is successfully resisted by the Pharisaic doctor, Gamaliel,[||] who gives them very humane and

---

[*] See the historical books of the Old Testament everywhere.

[†] Acts xix. 12.

[‡] Matt. xiv. 36. Mark vi. 56.

[§] After their deliverance, the apostles go "early in the morning" (*ὑπὸ τὸν ὄρθρον*) into the Temple and teach. The same is remarked of the practice of Jesus; Luke xxi. 38. *πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ὤρθριζε*, &c.—John viii. 2. *ὄρθρου δὲ πάλιν*, &c. Such coincidences are deserving of attention, as helping the mind to a more vivid realisation of the circumstances of primitive Christianity.

[||] This was probably the celebrated Jewish doctor, called by way of eminence Rabban, son of Simeon (according to ecclesiastical tradition, the Simeon who blessed the infant Jesus in the Temple) and grandson of Hillel; also the instructor of Paul. He survived the destruction of Jerusalem. Some have supposed, he was secretly a Christian; and tradition has gone so far as to assert that he was actually baptized by enlightened advice, illustrated by examples from their own history:* in consequence of which the purpose of putting the apostles to death is relinquished. They are beaten, reprimanded, and dismissed. As the apostles were excluded from the Council chamber when Gamaliel delivered his opinion, the speech ascribed to him (unless we admit the supposition of plenary inspiration) must have been framed in accordance with what were afterwards ascertained to have been his sentiments: and the same observation applies more strongly still to the secret deliberations of the Sanhedrim on a former occasion (iv. 15—17). V. 42 has the character of a general summary, terminating a separate narrative.

6. (vi.—vii.) This division comprehends the history of Stephen, making a sort of whole by itself: we may here discern the first faint traces of that more liberal movement, which excited so violent a reaction of Jewish prejudice, and which was afterwards taken up and sustained with such vigour by Paul.

The absence of all definite chronology, and the fragmentary character of the relation which is here wrought into the general history, are sufficiently indicated by the vague terms with which the narrative opens;—"in those days." We here meet for the first time in the New Testament with the distinction between the Hellenists and the Hebrews; the former being those Jews who from birth or education spoke Greek; the latter, natives of Palestine, and employing its Aramæan dialect. It is easy to conceive, that between the native Jews and those who had been reared amidst the influences of Grecian civilization, some

---

Peter and John (*Winer*, *Biblisches Realwörterbuch*, *Gamal.*). Onkelos the Targumist is said to have shown great respect for his memory, by burning a quantity of frankincense at his funeral. There can be no doubt that he died a Jew. See the authorities quoted by *Lightfoot* and *Wetstein in loc.*

* Gamaliel quotes the cases of Theudas and Judas of Galilee. If this be the Theudas who raised a revolt in the time of Claudius, and who was defeated and killed by the Procurator Cuspius Fadus, (*Joseph. Antiq.* xx. 5. 1.) Luke has erred in his chronology; especially as he speaks of Judas the *Galilæan* (*Gaulonite. Joseph. Antiq.* xviii.), who excited a tumult in the days of the ἀποτίμησις or taxing under Quirinus, President of Syria, which occurred in the reign of Augustus. Many commentators have therefore supposed there were two Theudases; one before the time of Judas in the reign of Augustus; the other, referred to by Josephus. This is a very easy but a very unsatisfactory mode of solving historical difficulties; the too frequent recourse to which must by this time, one would have thought, have totally destroyed its credit. The nature and obvious origin of this speech of Gamaliel preclude the necessity of looking for chronological accuracy; and the allusion to Theudas, if he be really the person mentioned by Josephus, furnishes an internal mark for limiting the earliest possible date of the narrative where it occurs. It is very improbable there should be two persons of the same name existing under precisely similar circumstances, and meeting with the same fate, at different periods. Ludovicus Capellus does not hesitate to ascribe the inconsistency of this account with that of Josephus to a slip of the memory in Luke: and *Valesius* supposes the mention of Theudas to have been introduced by a *prolepsis*. Their opinions are given by Kuinoel *in loc.*

feelings of jealously, almost approaching to national, might readily arise. Both descriptions of Jews resided in Jerusalem, and had furnished converts to the new faith. In the daily distributions of the common fund, the Hellenists complained that their widows had been neglected; and it is not in itself improbable, that at Jerusalem the Hebrew interest would be the most powerful. To prevent unfairness and satisfy all parties, the apostles, not wishing to assume the management of the pecuniary affairs of the Church, suggested the appointment of proper officers, to superintend the distribution of the public fund. These were the deacons:* and as this is the first occurrence in the history of any mention of ecclesiastical discipline, it is desirable to notice the order of proceeding. The Church at large elected the deacons; and the choice was then confirmed by the apostles with prayer and the imposition of hands. Of the seven individuals appointed to this office, all, if we may judge from their names, were Hellenists; and amongst them we find Nicolaus, a proselyte of *Antioch*. From this circumstance it is probable, though the tenour of the narrative in itself gives no such indication, that Hebrew deacons had existed before, and that these seven Hellenists were now added to their number to counteract their undue influence.

V. 7 is like the termination or general summing up of a separate narrative, giving an account of the state of the Church at the time of the transactions just described. An important circumstance is here mentioned, that a great number of Priests embraced the faith.—Who were these Priests, and to what party did they belong? It seems to me not improbable, they were Pharisees. It is true, that during the ministry of Jesus, the Pharisees were the bitterest of his opponents: but they were a sect wise in this generation; and finding it impossible to crush the rising popularity of the new religion, they would naturally make a virtue of necessity, and yield to the powerful impulse of the age; they would go along with it, and try to guide it to their own purposes, since they could not absolutely resist it. Their object would be to reduce Christianity to the character of a Jewish sect, and to keep it within the limits of Jewish exclusiveness. It was from the Pharisees that the Judaizing teachers, who thwarted the ministry of Paul, chiefly proceeded; and their temporary concession to Christianity will sufficiently account for the revived hostility of the Sadducees against it, with whom they were perpetually at variance. The Sadducees were opposed to every display of religious enthusiasm, by whatever party manifested; the Pharisees could make common cause with it when it suited their own views. At a later period, when the comprehensive spirit of the Gospel was more decidedly expressed, the Pharisaic bigotry showed itself again—unchanged, as bitter and implacable as ever.

---

* The Greek word διάκονοι does not occur in this passage.

Of the Hellenists who had been appointed deacons, the most zealous and energetic in the propagation of the faith was Stephen. He appears only for a moment on the scene; but his short eventful history is full of significance. From the nature of the charges brought against him, he would seem to have been too liberal for his Jewish associates; he was accused of uttering blasphemous words against the temple and the law, of having asserted, that Jesus would destroy the one and abolish the other. Christ during his ministry incurred the former charge: but this is the first occasion on which the abolition of the law, so frequent a topic in the teachings of Paul, is distinctly alluded to in the history of Christianity. We may reasonably suppose, that among the Hellenistic Jews, who had lived in habitual intercourse with heathens in the great cities of the Grecian world, there must have been not a few better prepared than their brethren of Palestine, to understand and adopt the enlarged humanity and all-embracing love of the great prophet and reformer of Nazareth.* This circumstance alone would tend to increase the want of mutual good understanding between the two classes of Jews. The motives, which led to their appointment, render it highly improbable that the deacons belonged to the Judaizing Christians; amongst them, we have seen, was a proselyte of Antioch: and it is very likely that the greater freedom of their principles, especially on the subject of Jewish observances, occasioned the outburst of bigotry, which descended with the greatest violence on Stephen, the most conspicuous of their number. The Pharisees, we may be sure, would be active in suppressing such dangerous tendencies.

It is no serious objection to this view of the case, that the parties who took the lead in opposing Stephen appear themselves to have been Hellenists,—members of the synagogue of the *Libertini* in Jerusalem. When a certain class of persons lies under the imputation of obnoxious doctrines, those members of the class who still adhere to the old and recognized views, are peculiarly sensitive to any implication in the charge, and bitter to an extreme against the innovators. There are none more ready than such men for the language and acts of persecution. If the party here referred to were of the description, which the best reading and interpretation of the passage render probable,[*] they were drawn from that condition in life, which would lay them most open to such influences, and make them ambitious of distinction by becoming thorough partizans of the Priests and the Pharisees.

---

* It is a circumstance not to be lost sight of, that the mind of Jesus himself was formed, and the inspiration which nourished it, imbibed—and, according to the primitive tradition preserved in the three first Evangelists, his whole public ministry, with the exception of its closing scenes, carried on—in that region of the land of Palestine, which lay most remote from the centre of sacerdotal influence, and was most intimately connected, through the intercourses of trade and commerce, with the heathen world; in that one of the three divisions of the country, which is expressly called in the language of the prophet applied to it by Matthew (iv. 15.), "*Galilee of the Gentiles.*"

Through their machinations, Stephen is brought before the Synedrium, and vindicates himself in a long speech, reciting the principal events of Hebrew history from the time of Abraham. The speech is imperfect, and breaks off suddenly, probably from the clamorous interruptions of his accusers. It contains a few deviations from the text of the Old Testament, but betrays its Jewish character in the frequent use of the sacred number of *forty*, as a measure of time. Its general object is to convict the Jewish bigots of inconsistency—clamorous for the authority of the law, which they have constantly violated, and full of zeal for the honour of Moses—here compared with Christ—whom their forefathers, while he was with them on earth, rejected and insulted. Roused to a state of rapturous enthusiasm by the peril and excitement of the occasion, Stephen sees the heavens opened, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God, and gives utterance to the strong conviction which seized him in a fervent ejaculation of faith. At once he is overwhelmed with a mingled outbreak of sacerdotal and popular violence; is cast out of the city; and, as a blasphemer, is stoned to death. The concluding scenes of Stephen's life, recal those of Christ. In the moment of dissolution he commends his spirit to the Lord Jesus; prays for his murderers, and then, in the beautiful language of primitive Christianity, falls asleep.[†] Among those who took part in this persecution, we find mention made for the first time of a young Hellenist, named Saul.

7. (viii.) The four first verses of this chapter form an intro-

---

[*] Λιβερτίνων, which Wetstein considers, but without sufficient reason, as a corruption of Λιβυστίνων. It is most probably the same word with the Latin *libertini*, and denotes here Jewish slaves, that had been freed by their Roman masters. If we take the word in this sense, the first καί in the enumeration of the local designations that follow must be translated *both*. The chief centres of Jewish colonization are mentioned in connection with these *libertini*—Cyrene, Alexandria, Cilicia, and Proconsular Asia. Some apposite passages, illustrative of the condition of these Jewish freedmen, are quoted from Tacitus and Philo, by Kuinoel *in loc.*

[†] ἐκοιμήθη. Comp. John xi. 11—14.

duction to the next division of the history, which treats of Philip's missionary labours, and connect it with the foregoing narrative. The death of Stephen was the signal for a general persecution of the brethren, which was probably excited at first by a strong reaction against the free sentiments of some of the Hellenists, but, once put in motion, raged indiscriminately against all the professors of the new faith. The controversy was now begun between the rigid Judaizers and those who embraced Christianity as a comprehensive faith, which constitutes the governing interest of the future history, and which determined the direction, as it occasioned the chief perils and difficulties, of the ensuing ministry of Paul. At present, the principal promoter of the persecution was Saul himself. This persecution broke up the community at Jerusalem, and dispersed the members of it—chiefly, we may suppose, the Hellenists—into distant parts. Only the apostles remained at Jerusalem; a fact in harmony with the preceding supposition, since the apostles up to this time were all Jewish Christians.

The dispersion thus occasioned scattered the seeds of the faith. We must notice some of the effects of it. Philip[*] goes down into Samaria to preach, attesting his ministry by the same healing miracles which had been performed by Christ. Philip baptized the converts, and amongst them a celebrated *thaumaturgist* of the name of Simon, who had acquired great influence among all classes in Samaria, and was revered by them as the Great Power of God. When the tidings of Philip's success reached Jerusalem, the apostles there assembled sent down Peter and John to confirm his ministry by the imposition of hands, and the communication of the gifts of the spirit. Simon offers to purchase these gifts with money, and is rebuked by Peter in a tone of stern condemnation, which, whatever explanation we may give of the whole story of Simon, bears witness to the unworldly and disinterested spirit, which in all the earliest traditions of Christianity is represented from the first to have accompanied the ministrations of the Gospel. The apostles return home to Jerusalem, preaching as they go in many villages of the Samaritans. Philip is divinely directed (v. 26) to proceed to the south, and in the neighbourhood of Gaza converts and baptizes an African Jew, an officer of the Queen of Ethiopia,[†] and through him finds the means of conveying Christianity into distant regions. An air of mystery is thrown by the narrator around the transaction. After the baptism, Philip suddenly vanishes, and is carried by the spirit to Azotus, from which point he evangelizes the whole of the western coast of Palestine, as far north as Cæsarea. It must be recollected, that this earliest dispersion of Christianity was probably effected by an Hellenistic Jew.

---

[*] This was not Philip the apostle (viii. 14); but probably the same who is called (xxi. 8) the evangelist, and perhaps one of the seven deacons; if so, an Hellenist. This account of Philip seems to imply, that the Gospel was now preached for the first time in Samaria: this cannot however be literally true, since it is inconsistent with the fact of our Lord himself having preached in those parts. (John iv.)

[†] Perhaps *Meroe.* Christianity subsists to this day in Abyssinia.

8. (ix. 1—30.) The general history of the Palestinensine churches is here broken off for a short space, to make room for the recital of an event, which had a most powerful influence on the future development of Christianity. The young Hellenist Saul, full of the religious excitement which sometimes precedes a great and decided change of opinion, kept up the hottest persecution against the Christians. The circumstances of his birth and education furnish a key to the interpretation of his character. Sprung from the purest Jewish blood, trained in the principles of a rigid Pharisaism,* and receiving the instructions of his riper youth at the feet of Gamaliel, all the influences through which he had passed had contributed to determine the fiery ardour of his temperament and his quick religious sensibilities in one exclusive direction—that of boundless and unquestioning devotion to the religion of his fathers. Fresh from the schools, and ignorant of the deeper interests which were now beginning every where to exercise men's thoughts, his strongest prejudices made him regard it as a duty, to check the progress of the lax principles, originally promulgated by the Galilean teacher, which were gaining ground among his Hellenistic brethren,—and distinctly to repel from himself, as an Hellenist, all suspicion of participating in such heresies. But the mind of Paul was not fitted by nature to acquiesce in compromise. Should any circumstance occur to change its convictions, it was to be expected that it would not rest half way in a Jewish Christianity, but would carry out the fundamental principles of the Gospel to their legitimate conclusions, and proceed to the utter abolition of the ceremonial law, as a ground of justification. The first impulse to this change is recorded in the portion of Acts immediately before us.

The Hellenistic freethinkers† having fled from the rage of persecution in various directions, many of them to the rich heathen cities of the north,—Saul, in the overflowing of his zeal, obtained letters from the High Priest to the Synagogues of Damascus, that he might have power to arrest persons of both sexes, whom he found there infected with the new opinions, and bring them under ecclesiastical censure and punishment in Jerusalem. On his road to that city, he is suddenly cast to the ground by a great light, and hears the voice of Jesus rebuking him for his persecution of the Church.[*] On rising, he finds himself blind, and is led by the hand to Damascus. A providential preparation is made for his reception there, by a vision which is sent to a disciple called Ananias,[†] who is directed to visit Paul and to restore his sight.[‡] At Damascus he remains for some time, preaching in the synagogues and confuting the Jews. Becoming thus an object of hatred, the Jews form a design against his life; and he is compelled to make his escape from Damascus by a stratagem. When he reaches Jerusalem, the disciples are naturally afraid of him; but he is at length introduced to them by Barnabas, and describes his conversion. With characteristic boldness and ardour, he vindicates the cause of Christ, and disputes with the Hellenistic Jews, who now regarded him as an apostate. His life is again in danger; when the brethren convey him to Cæsarea, and thence send him forward to Tarsus.

---

* Philippians iii. 5.

† It seems to me evident from the tenour of the narrative, that the persecution was directed chiefly against this class of Christians. Why else should the apostles have been allowed to remain quietly in Jerusalem? As the heads of the sect, they would naturally have been the first objects of attack. I can only explain the fact, on the supposition that in their language and teaching they still retained the views peculiar to Jewish Christians.

Here for the present terminates the history of Saul. Though the events now related appear to follow one another in close succession, yet a period of some years is implied in their occurrence, and the completion of Saul's conversion was not the work of a day.[§] We know from his epistle to the Galatians, that three years at least must have elapsed between his arrival at Damascus and his setting out for Jerusalem, and that part of this time was spent in Arabia. Of these circumstances the history in the Acts makes no mention.

9. (ix. 31—xi. 18.) The limits within which this paper must be confined, render it necessary to be very brief in the remaining analysis of the history. We can only exhibit a summary of

---

[*] The men who were with him heard the voice, but saw no one. Voices of this kind were called *Bath Col* by the Rabbins.

[†] This mutual correspondence of the vision to Saul and of that to Ananias, implying a providential superintendence to bring about a joint result, is similar to that which afterwards occurs in the case of Peter and Cornelius.

[‡] The expression is, "immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales"—ὡσεὶ λεπίδες. Is this a symbolical mode of expressing the change which had come over his *mind*? like the words Ephes. i. 18. "the *eyes* of your understanding being *enlightened*."

[§] In the epistle to the Galatians, Paul speaks distinctly of receiving his gospel, "not from men, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ,"—δι' ἀποκαλύψεως—i. 12; but it is remarkable, that, in so full an enumeration of all the circumstances of that period of his life, he should not once allude to the very extraordinary events attending his conversion, as described two or three times over in the book of Acts.

principal and characteristic events. The persecution of the believers ceases.* Peter avails himself of the rest to preach in the interior of the country; performs miracles at Lydda and Joppa; and is symbolically instructed by a vision to part with the narrowness of his Jewish prejudices. At the same time a corresponding vision occurs to the heathen, Cornelius, directing him to send for Peter. The gospel is preached to the heathen; Peter perceives that God is no respecter of persons; the holy spirit descends on Cornelius and his friends and kinsmen; and Peter, thus assured of their acceptance with God, commands them to be baptized.† On his return to Jerusalem, Peter is called to account by the stricter Jews for his recognition of the heathen; but vindicates his conduct by relating what had occurred. This is an important crisis in the development of Christianity.

10. (xi. 19—30.) A similar crisis takes place at other points in the now expanding circle of Christian influence and agency. Some Cyprian and Cyrenaican Hellenists preach Jesus at Antioch to the heathens.‡ Barnabas is sent down from Jerusalem to inquire into the state of things in the great metropolis of Syria. He here finds such a prospect of success, that he goes to Tarsus to induce Paul to assist him in preaching the Gospel at Antioch. They labour together for a whole year in that city; and the number of believers increases to such an extent, that they acquire now, for the first time, a distinguishing appellation.§ A famine occasions great distress to the poorer classes in Palestine. For the relief of the Jewish Christians, who principally belonged to these classes,|| Saul and Barnabas make a collection among the wealthier disciples at Antioch.

---

* Ascribed by some to the conversion of Saul, by others to the insults offered by Caligula to the religion of the Jews. See Dr. Benson's History of the First Planting.

† In the ordinary course of things, baptism preceded the communication of the gifts of the spirit. The order was reversed in the present case, to justify Peter in administering the rite to heathens. It is to be noticed, that the sign and evidence of the actual communication of the spirit here mentioned is, "the magnifying of God through *speaking with tongues*," λαλούντων γλώσσαις, καὶ μεγαλυνόντων τὸν θεόν. (x. 46.)

‡ When it is asserted, (xi. 19.) that the gospel up to this time had been preached "to none but unto the Jews only," this must be understood of the general practice and immediate object—of the leading tendency which had hitherto prevailed.

§ Χριστιανοί. This name was, perhaps, given them in derision by the Gentiles of Antioch. The termination *anus* is Latin, and was usually put to words which expressed the name of a party opposed to any of the Cæsars; *e. g. Pompeiani, Pertinaciani.* The devotion of the disciples to their crucified Lord and Master probably suggested the use of the term. See *Wetstein in loc.* Throughout the N. T. the term occurs only here and xxvi. 28, and 1 Peter iv. 16. At first it was not used by the Christians of themselves.

|| Ebionitæ.

11. (xii.) Herod Agrippa persecutes the Church, and kills James the son of Zebedee. At the Passover, to please the Jews, he throws Peter into prison. This is Peter's third imprisonment: the account of it differs from that of the former two in a more circumstantial accompaniment of the marvellous. The sudden death of Herod is recorded—apparently in the light of a divine judgment upon him for his treatment of the Christians. Saul and Barnabas return to Antioch, taking with them John Mark.

12. (xiii.—xiv.) Here commences properly the second section of the history—treating of the missionary labours of Paul. The words with which it opens, are like those of a separate and independent narrative, for the names of Barnabas and Saul are here introduced among the prophets and teachers of Antioch, as if they had never been mentioned before. Saul and Barnabas are set apart by the Church at Antioch, under the guidance of the holy spirit, for a peculiar mission into the adjoining territory. They first visit the island of Cyprus, where Saul converts the Roman Proconsul, and delivers him from the influence which the sorcerer Elymas had acquired over his mind. This is the second collision we have noticed between the divine power of Christianity and the fashionable *thaumaturgy* of the times. Here, without any indication of the reason, we find Saul's name suddenly changed into *Paul*.* Setting sail from Cyprus, they visit in succession a number of towns in Pamphylia, Pisidia and Lycaonia, preaching in the synagogues, performing miracles, warning the Jews of the consequences of their unbelief, and declaring their purpose, since the Jews would not hearken, of addressing themselves to the Gentiles. Before they quitted the country, they appointed in every church, by prayer, fasting and commendation to God, presbyters or elders for the administration of its affairs. On their return to Antioch, they report how God had opened the door of faith to the Gentiles.

13. (xv. 1—35.) It was from Antioch that this new movement had proceeded. The rigid Judaizers at Jerusalem were alarmed at the progress of these novelties, and viewed with jealousy a centre of rival influence. The following proceedings were the consequence. Some of the Jewish Christians come

---

* It is possible, that the prospect of a successful ministry, now opened before him in the Gentile world, might have induced him, in conformity with a practice usual among the Jews of this age, to *Romanize* his name. Another view may be suggested; that his name was originally *Paul*, since he was born a Roman citizen (xxii. 28.); but that, when he was first introduced to the Jewish, or (expressed more correctly) the Palestinensine Christians, and in the original memorials designed immediately for their use—by way of conciliating their sensitive prejudices—it was *Hebraized* into *Saul*.

down to Antioch, oppose Barnabas and Paul, and enforce the necessity of circumcision and a strict observance of the Mosaic law. To settle this disputed point, Paul and Barnabas undertake a mission to Jerusalem, announcing, as they pass through Phœnicia and Samaria, the conversion of the heathen. Notwithstanding the opposition of the Pharisaic zealots, Peter and James, the apostles of chief influence, confirm the immunity of Gentile converts from the ritual of Mosaism, limiting the restraints to which they should be subjected to abstinence in these four points: 1. from meats offered to idols; 2. from fornication; 3. from things strangled; 4. from blood. These prohibitions have, probably, a twofold object—the prevention of a lapse into idolatry, and the avoiding of invincible offence to the stricter Jews.* A certain degree of compromise, therefore, is involved in them. These resolutions are conveyed to the disciples at Antioch in a letter, written in the joint names of the *apostles*, the *elders*, and *all the Church*. It is important to notice in the decrees of this first Christian council the three distinct elements of the authority from which they emanated.

14. (xv. 36—xviii.) After their return to Antioch, Paul and Barnabas prepare for a second missionary journey. They differ as to the propriety of taking John Mark with them, who had forsaken them in their former expedition. Barnabas adheres to Mark, and Paul takes Silas with him. Paul visits the Churches he had planted, delivering to them the resolutions which had been agreed upon by the council at Jerusalem. Paul attaches to himself a young disciple, named Timothy, the son of a Greek by a Jewish mother. According to the Rabbinical law, Timothy was born a Jew;† and consequently there was no violation of the principles laid down by the conference at Jerusalem, in requiring him to submit to circumcision. At the same time Paul himself could hardly have deemed such a step essential; and his adoption of it was avowedly a concession to Jewish prejudice, and proves its intensity. Though Paul traversed Cilicia, it is not mentioned that he ever visited, on this journey, his native city of Tarsus. Paul is directed by a vision to go over into Macedonia; visits Philippi; is brought before the Roman magistrates; is miraculously delivered from prison; and passes through Amphipolis, Apollonia, Thessalonica, and Berea, to Athens—pursued everywhere with unrelenting malignity by the Jews, and yet making not a few converts from the higher classes, especially women. In preaching at Athens, Paul adapts his discourse to

---

* *Wetstein in loc.*

† *Partus sequitur ventrem.* See extracts from the Rabbins in *Wetstein.*

the peculiar circumstances in which he is placed; but as he looks upon the idolatries which encompass him, "his spirit is stirred within him."

In Corinth he meets with more success than at Athens; and continues preaching there for a year and a half. The malice of his persecutors cuts off some of the resources on which he had hitherto depended for his support. At least, in this part of his history, we first find mention made of his following a trade as a means of subsistence. He works with Aquila and Priscilla, who had been comprehended in the decree of Claudius for the expulsion of the Jews from Italy,* at their occupation of tent-making. Paul is arraigned by the Jews at the tribunal of the proconsul of Achaia, Annæus Gallio, the brother of the philosopher Seneca, who treats the whole question at issue between the two parties with the contemptuous indifference characteristic of the public men of that day. Paul sails from Corinth into Asia with Aquila and Priscilla, whom he leaves at Ephesus; and then returns once more into Palestine, not however this time, according to the reading adopted by the most recent critics,† for the purpose of visiting Jerusalem. He lands at Cæsarea, and thence proceeds at once to Antioch. This was the termination of his second missionary journey.

15. (xviii. 23—xxi. 17.) Paul revisits once more the churches which he had founded in Galatia and Phrygia, and arrives at Ephesus, then the great centre of learning, commerce, and superstition on the western coast of Asia Minor. During his absence, an Alexandrine Jew, named Apollos, who was only acquainted with the preparatory discipline of John the Baptist, had come to Ephesus, and, meeting with Aquila and Priscilla, had been carried on by them to a perfect faith in Jesus Christ. His zeal and abilities fitted him admirably for a missionary in the present crisis of the church; and, desiring a wider field of exertion, he carried with him letters of recommendation into Achaia from the brethren at Ephesus, and rendered great service to the cause, especially in Corinth, by publicly confuting the Jewish party from the Scriptures. It would seem, that the battle of liberality was still maintained chiefly by the Hellenists.

In Ephesus, Paul on his arrival finds several persons, as Apollos had been, still only disciples of John, but whom he converts to Christianity, and endues with the gifts of the spirit. Finding the prejudice and obstinacy of the Jewish party invincible, Paul is obliged to form a separate communion, and opens a kind of public lecture or disputation in the school-room of a Greek sophist. Ephesus was a celebrated seat of thaumaturgic practices. These are everywhere successfully encountered by the power of Christianity; and numbers are so convinced of their errors, that they voluntarily burn their magical books or charms, known in history under the name of the Ephesian letters, which had hitherto been a great source of wealth and influence to them.—An opposition now arose to the apostle from another quarter. Those who derived a profit from the distinguishing superstition of the city became his enemies, and excited against him the blind fanaticism of the heathen populace. The apostle is protected against outrage on this occasion by the prudence and moderation of the civil power. He quits Ephesus, to pay a last visit to Greece; after which, taking ship at Philippi, he returns by a long coasting voyage, touching at various points by the way, where he bids an affectionate farewell to the brethren, towards Syria, and at length lands at Ptolemais. As he drew near to Palestine, the churches became increasingly earnest in their representations of the perils which awaited him, and the voice of prophecy continually warned him against proceeding further. At Tyre, the whole church, men, women, and children, accompanied him out of the gates of the city to the ship, and knelt down with him and prayed on the open shore. When he reached Cæsarea, Agabas, in the symbolical style of the ancient prophets, bound his hands and feet with his own girdle, to signify his impending fate. All these circumstances were only indications of the rising and deepening of that terrific storm which had long been preparing, and which was ready to burst upon him the moment he set his foot within the gates of Jerusalem—the centre of sacerdotal intolerance and malignity.

---

* This event furnishes chronological data for the history of Paul. Aquila and Priscilla must have arrived at Corinth somewhere between A. D. 41 and 54.

† See the reading adopted by Lachmann, and given by Griesbach in the margin.

16. (xxi. 18—xxviii.) Arrived in Jerusalem, he presents himself to the apostles, who could have enjoyed security there, only in consequence of being regarded as a Jewish sect—not actively exerting themselves against the observance of the law. They confirm all the tidings that had been conveyed to him, and urge him to court the danger which threatened him, by giving some public proof that he was a Jew.* With this view, he undertakes

---

* That the real ground of the hostility to Paul was a jealousy of *Hellenistic* liberalism, tending to the destruction of the old distinction between Jew and Gentile, is evident from many incidental notices in the concluding portions of the apostolic history. The tranquillity of the Christians in Jerusalem is well accounted for by the fact, which is stated (xxi. 20.): "there are many thousands of Jews which believe; and these are all *zealous of the law.*"

It is mentioned expressly (xxi. 40.), that Paul addressed the multitude "in the *Hebrew* tongue," as if he had usually spoken Greek; and that, when they perceived he spoke in Hebrew, they listened with the deeper attention. The object of Paul's speech is to bring evidence of his Jewish descent and education; to show, that even his con-to offer the sacrifices of four individuals who were under a vow. But all would not suffice. The feverish fanaticism of the zealots is enflamed by the celebration of the feast of Pentecost. He is violently assaulted in the very courts of the Temple, and saved from immediate destruction only by the prompt interposition of the Roman force then garrisoned in the adjoining fort of Antonia. A deadly conspiracy is formed against his life; which being made known to the commanding officer of the garrison, under whose custody he was then placed, he is sent away by night under a guard of soldiers, to the seat of the Roman government at Cæsarea. Here he is confronted with his accusers in the presence of the Governor, and, availing himself of his privilege as a Roman citizen, appeals to Cæsar.

This appeal carries him into a new scene—full of wonder and interest—the vast metropolis of the then civilized world. But enough only is disclosed to awaken—without gratifying—our curiosity. The scene is opened, to close again immediately. We see the hero of Christianity placed in this new and strange world. We see him with unbroken spirit again resuming his customary duties. We discern already the signs of future divisions, and can trace the elements of coming jealousy and strife already weaving their insidious meshes around him. We seem almost to hear the harsh voice of faction and the wild yell of persecution obscurely swelling upon the ear from the remote distance:—when—the narrative abruptly terminates, and the apostle vanishes from our eyes for ever.

III.

From this analysis of the apostolic history, we may draw the following brief and general inferences.

1. It must be noticed, that the principal centres of Christian influence in this early age, were rich, populous, and commercial cities, where the free intercourse of persons of various religions, and drawn together from different parts of the world, necessarily broke the bonds of ancient prejudice, and inspired a certain freedom and liberality of sentiment—Antioch, Ephesus, Philippi, Thessalonica, Corinth. Jerusalem must likewise be numbered

---

version to Christianity was completed by one who was "a devout man according to the law;" and to justify his quitting Jerusalem and turning to the Gentiles, by pleading the authority of a direct command from heaven. The multitude hear him patiently, till he alludes to his mission to the *Gentiles*; when all their prejudice and hate are at once in arms, and they are clamorous for his instant death.

I cannot better describe the precise character and moral significance of the Hellenists at this period than by representing them—as the conducting medium of Christianity from *Judæa* to the *world*.

among these centres: but this arose from the circumstances connected with the origin of the religion;—it was the chief seat of a Jewish Christianity, and the source from which proceeded the bitterest opposition by which its progress among the heathen was thwarted, and its expansion into a religion for the world attempted to be confined. In this first chapter of Ecclesiastical History, the names of Athens and of Rome occur, but not yet as principal seats of Christianity. It is remarkable that, throughout the Acts of the Apostles, there are very few references to Galilee, which was the earliest and principal scene of our Saviour's personal ministry; and that Capernaum and its neighbourhood, where most of his miracles were performed and his most important discourses delivered, are not once alluded to. In the minds of the first disciples, the resurrection and ascension of Jesus, which had taken place at Jerusalem, and were the immediate subjects of their preaching and testimony, appear for the time to have completely eclipsed the memory of the quiet didactic influences and less striking events of his earlier ministry. These became objects of interest and inquiry at a somewhat later period; and by the feeling thus excited our present Gospels were gradually called into existence.

2. The main topics of the doctrine preached by the apostles were repentance, remission of sins, the approach of the kingdom of God, the general judgment, the restoration of all things, and faith as the condition of the gifts of the spirit. These doctrines were modified in their application to heathens, and blended with a very plain and distinct assertion of the unity and spirituality of God, of the fraternity of the whole human race (Acts xvii. 26), and of the resurrection and judgment at the bar of Christ, of all men. The synagogues, which in those days were much frequented by religious heathens, were the points of influence always selected in preference by the Christian preachers, so long as the free use of them was granted. But in many cases, as at Ephesus, it soon became necessary to found separate and independent societies. For some time after Christ's ascension, the conception of the nature and design of Christianity appears to have still continued essentially Jewish; and during this period no serious dissentions arose within the bosom of the Christian community itself. But with the development of a more comprehensive spirit, which aimed at embracing the heathens in the church without compelling them to submit to the ritual of Judaism, two parties formed themselves—the Liberal and the Jewish, between which the breach was continually widening, and at last became wholly irreconcileable. The enlightened views of Paul, which represent those of the Liberal or Hellen-

istic party, naturally found most acceptance amongst the devout heathen; while the zealots for the law chiefly belonged to the sect of the Pharisees. In the earliest constitution of the churches in Asia, much deference was yielded to the decrees of the apostles and elders assembled at Jerusalem; but these decrees related principally to the delicate points of discipline arising out of the peculiar relation of the Heathens to the Jews, and of the Christians to both; they appear to have been conveyed rather as the advice of brethren than the commands of superiors; and, as the differences of opinion between different parties of believers increased, the authority freely conceded to them at first must have gradually declined.

3. Before I terminate this paper, already so long, I must, nevertheless, dwell for one moment on the relation of the history exhibited by the Gospels to that which is contained in the Book of Acts.—All the incidents of the former are confined within the yet unbroken circle of Jewish ideas and institutions. In the latter, we find the clear and definite outline of that circle already broken, and the light that had been shut up within it streaming out in all directions, and mingling with the variously conflicting elements of heathen civilization.—In the Gospels, we contemplate the quiet and holy life of Jesus, silently working like the power of the Being in whose name he spoke, in the towns and villages, and amidst the lakes and mountains and wildernesses, of the land of his fathers,—unfolding ideas and principles that had reference to a yet remote future, rather than to a present which could not yet comprehend them. All here is elevated, spiritual, heavenly—the Father represented among his children in the life and teachings of his chosen Son. But when we turn to the next chapter of the history, that beneficent presence has already vanished from the earth, and the conflict with reality is begun. The law, the prophets, and the divine wisdom of Christ have found their way into the heart of great cities, corrupted by the enervating refinement of Athens, or rioting in the grosser luxury of Rome.—In the Gospels, the divine element of Christianity is wrapped up, as it were, in the yet unexpanded germ—the quintescence of power and wisdom and love, which the prolonged meditation of centuries may continue to extract without the fear of exhaustion. In the Acts we witness the earliest process of development—the first shooting forth of the ramifications of the future tree—the commencement of the history of our actual civilization.—In this first stage of moral progress, the most interesting feature, and the clearest indication of the superintending hand of Providence, is recognised in the transition from the particular to the uni-

versal—in the conversion of the life and teachings of a Jewish prophet into an influence, which gradually destroyed the organic principle of the old world, and breathed a new life into humanity.

For such a crisis a mind was wanted, fitted by its energy, its decision, its intrepidity, and its zeal, to carry men across the gulf which separated the two worlds, and to effect the transition from the old to the new. That mind existed in Paul, the instrument created by God for the accomplishment of this great design. He stands out to us, in his writings and his life, a perfect model of moral energy and devotedness. Even his human infirmities had an affinity with the task which he was commissioned to execute. With less of what some have condemned as dogmatizing and imperious, he could never have been borne through the straights and difficulties which opposed his course. With less of what was prudent and accommodating, he could never have moulded the wayward passions and interests of men to his ends: his energy would have spent itself in vain; and the cause entrusted to him must have been shivered to atoms by collision with invincible obstacles.

In the glimpses vouchsafed to us of Christ, through the precious memorials of the Evangelists, it is difficult for the coldest mind to resist the impression, that we are admitted for a few solemn moments into more immediate communion with the holiness and benignity of God. But in the history of Paul we can never forget, that we are contemplating a man "of like passions with ourselves;" it is as a man we honour him—a man faithful to conscience and duty under the most trying and arduous circumstances: and the very facts of his life and character, which prove that he was but a man, only make his example doubly instructive, by showing us that all the power of faith and all the control of principle, are constantly needed to bring us even to a distant approximation to the standard of Christ.

The apostles were excellent men; but still they were men; and a comparison with their history only places in bolder relief and a clearer light the superhuman perfection and beauty of the mind, from which they derived their highest inspirations. The human alloy of their characters serves to break the transition from the divine to the human, and furnishes the tempering medium through which truths and principles, almost too pure and perfect for practical adoption, are made level to the capacities and adjusted to the standard of ordinary humanity. The brief biography of Jesus takes us to the very sources of the fresh dayspring: in the history of the apostles, we find ourselves again surrounded by the world's objects, and breathing the world's atmosphere,—

looking out, as through an opened portal, into the immense vista of the future destinies of our race—and seeing them through their vast and varied extent of sorrow, infirmity, and sin, warmed and quickened by the healing of those divine beams which, as we believe, God has decreed shall never more be extinguished.

J. J. T.

Art. II.—PRACTICAL REMARKS ON POPULAR EDUCATION. By A Schoolmaster. No. 2.

If any doubt rested on the argument in favour of educating the people derivable from the mental endowments of which man is possessed, it would be easily and fully removed by contemplating the rich treasuries of knowledge which lie around us. The world to the instructed eye wears every appearance of a school—of a school fitted up almost to superfluity with incitements to the human intellect. You cannot take a step; you cannot exert the power of vision; nay, if you are a person of cultivation, you cannot think a thought, but some kingdom of nature presents the varied assemblage of its images, the multiform abundance of its nutriment, its solid realities or elegant adornments, spreading them out before you, to invite, refresh, and strengthen your powers. And who can think that this "feast of fat things" was designed to remain untouched, or how could that be meant for a few which lies open to all? And had it been the divine purpose to prepare a school for the training and calling forth of the human faculties, what other arrangement than the actual one could have been made? Here are objects which lie upon the surface to win our attention, and such are the connections which exist in the universe, you do but cast your eye on one thing and you are gently led forward into a boundless variety. Key-notes to the harmonies of nature lie on every hand. One skilful touch in almost any quarter will awaken a chorus. And there are objects which barely appear to the first glance of the eye, or shrouded in obscurity, sunk beneath superincumbent masses, to be reached and fathomed only by lengthened and intense application of thought. And thus by a union of that which is easy with that which is difficult, of the revealed with the hidden, the palpable with the mysterious, the beauty of the exterior with the wonder and the glory of the internal structure, has the Great Teacher made a wise and curious provision for seizing the attention of the mind, and carrying forward beyond any bounds which we can now conceive, the important work of its education. And in this school there is no exclusiveness. A willing mind is the only requisite for admission. Its doors are ever open; its lessons ever displayed; its invitations ever going forth:

"Ho! every one that thirsteth come ye to the waters."

And shall we, who in our higher functions can but consider ourselves doorkeepers to the temple of truth, venture to erect barriers of our own; to close this portal, and that against brethren who have the same right to enter as we ourselves? Why not take rather a generous pleasure in witnessing and encouraging our fellow men, of all classes, as they come hither to pay their homage. Surely the great master of the feast designed that his bounty should be partaken of. When he spread the heavens as a canopy and the verdure of the earth as a carpet, and poured around the upper ocean of air, and filled it here with odours and there with music, and everywhere with light, or when he hollowed out the depths of the sea and placed therein things innumerable both small and great, but all full of contrivance and power; or when he built up the globe on which we stand, with its terraces of rocks and all the multiplicity of its fossil wonders;—in any and in every case of the intellectual provisions he has made, I, at least, cannot doubt but that he was furnishing means for man's gratification and improvement; and therefore until I hear a voice co-ordinate with the voice of Nature, warning the people to keep aloof from provinces in its empire, I shall consider that every man, whatever his condition, is a citizen of the world, is free of the universe around us, and ought to be esteemed of man as he is loved of God, in proportion to the degree in which he avails himself of his birthright, and shows his gratitude by his ready and cheerful obedience.

If, then, I proceed in considering what ought to be taught in our popular schools, to give certain preferences, and thereby to make certain exclusions, let it not be imagined that I would be more niggard than Nature, or encourage a whit less liberal and catholic spirit than hers. But amid the boundless treasures of knowledge we are all obliged to submit to restrictions. The capacity of the individual mind, large as it is, is not equal to the immensity of things; nor is time nor opportunity given, except in a few cases, for more than a very superficial survey, together with a little deeper insight into one or two departments. We are all under laws of necessity—laws, I mean, from which there is no safe escape, which oblige us to make our election and limit our efforts, and narrow the range of our mind. If we would "provide things honest in the sight of all men," if we would be of some slight service to our fellow men, we must choose our plot of ground, fix our homestead—a tiny spot on the wide earth—and make the best for happiness and use, of the resources which it offers; nor is there any spot, however small, nor any condition, however lowly, but is so furnished as to yield pure and durable satisfactions of the mind. The freedom of the commonwealth of knowledge, of which every intelligent being is possessed, is not a useless, nay a baneful right of incessant wandering, but a beneficial power of choice, an unrestricted privilege of election, with a latitude which allows him to send forth his faculties in any direction he may please or circumstances may justify. "The world is all before us where to choose," and utility must be our guide. The good, the less or greater good, of this or that pursuit, under these or those circumstances—these are the elements on which our decision must be built. What then is the declaration of utility in regard to the subject of popular education? What things should be taught? There appear to my mind three qualifications—the scholars in our popular schools should be taught *what most concerns them to know—what they will have immediately to do*—and *what,* other things remaining the same, will *prove the most fruitful germs of future knowledge and power.*

But before I advert to the subjects of popular instruction, it may not be useless, as a preliminary, to make a few remarks on an important question, the determination of which will modify our opinions in regard to the three qualifications of which I have just made mention—namely, what studies should receive priority? The question is important not only in itself, but in consequence of prevalent mistakes. It will be found in the sequel that I shall ask for instruction in the English language as an indispensable requisite in a course of popular education, but I deprecate the continuance of the present practice of introducing the study, in schools where it is taught, at an early period of a child's education. It is not least among prevalent educational evils that teachers sometimes, to cover their own ignorance, and at others to conciliate favour with parents, are wont to make great professions and great attempts; and in consequence, to undertake, among other things, to teach what is called "English Grammar," as a part of almost the earliest instruction. The evil would not be so great if the instruction were limited to the simplest elements of grammar, and conveyed purely by word of mouth. It is generally, however, attempted by means of a book—I say attempted—for it is not taught,—and by means of a book most unfitted for the business, namely, "Murray's Grammar;" a work which will not, I trust, much longer hold its place in our elementary schools, and which has been banished into deserved neglect by those who know what such a book ought to be. In any manual, however, Grammar is an abstruse study—a study which addresses the intellect; a study which no effort, no skill can put upon a level with the understanding of a child. And accordingly the absurdity of introducing it early, is almost of necessity followed up by another absurdity, that of making it a mere matter of rote,—the lessons being committed to memory, and of course, for want of being understood, they are forgotten almost as soon as learnt, leaving behind no other result than the distaste and dislike which so mistaken a procedure cannot fail to engender. Not only grammar but other studies which require the mind to have been previously opened and disciplined, are also sometimes introduced before their time. And here I would remark, that in giving priority to studies, regard should be paid not so much to the age as to the degree of mental expansion; and it is very possible for a study in one case to be beneficially entered on at so early an age as nine years, for which in another the age of fourteen would be too soon. A greater error can scarcely be committed than to introduce a pursuit for which the mind is not prepared. A case came, not long since, under my own knowledge, in which Blair's Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Letters was put into the hands of a young person whose mind was utterly unable to comprehend its teachings. The teacher—one whose popularity is considerable, and whose emolument would be no mean reward for a most competent instructor—the teacher seems to have had (to have, I might say, for I am afraid the practice continues still) no great anxiety to ascertain whether the pupils were equal to the work through which they were carried, for it was her custom to set a portion of the Lectures *to be learnt by heart.* A portion was committed to memory some three or four times each week, and then the whole learnt during the previous week was repeated by rote on each following Monday, and so far as I could learn, without any explanation whatever being given or required —without, indeed, any endeavour to convey the meaning and ideas which the author designed to communicate. And this is a part of what is considered a superior, and what is certainly an expensive mode of education. Education among the monied classes requires reform, perhaps not less than among the poor, and while such modes as this prevail, what other result can be expected than mental apathy—minds which think not—minds which have no interest in intellectual pursuits—minds which can neither effectually guide themselves nor labour for the enlightenment of others?

In determining then what studies should receive preference in point of time, we must be careful to follow Nature. The rule contains too obvious a truth to require argument for its illustration or enforcement. Follow Nature in the order in which she developes the faculties. Disregard custom, traditional observance, inveterate prejudices, specious theories, and follow Nature. A better guide you cannot have; and if you deviate from the leadings of nature, you will not fail to commit more or less serious mistakes. Now the eye and the ear and the touch are among her earliest gifts. The power of thought she imparts at a later period, and only as a result of the influence of the senses—a result which in each case varies with the kind and degree of that influence. It is an empty storehouse—so to speak—which Nature gives in the mind of a child; and the eye, the ear, the touch are portals by which she designed that this storehouse should be filled; then, when it is replenished with images of external objects, and as these images are received and laid up, Nature of herself exercises and developes the thinking faculty, strengthens its energies, prepares for and demands their exercise, and from one degree of power and ability leads on to another. We see then that there must be elements of thought before there can exist anything which deserves the name of thinking, and any attempt to draw prematurely on the mental powers is as preposterous as to require wheat before the seed-time, or to expect wealth without previous accumulation. If then the senses are the first of our faculties which are fit for use, the senses should be first brought into action, exercised, developed; in a word, educated. A child can observe before it can reason; therefore first cultivate the power of observation, and afterwards the faculty of thought. The rule is one of universal application, and if it requires any limitation whatever, it is perhaps merely this, that in all our efforts to call out and invigorate the mind of a child, we should operate not by the abstractions of pure thought, not by the abstrusities and generalizations of grammar, but by and through the power of observation. This faculty must be first addressed; and for a long time, at whatever ulterior result we aim, we must work by the opportunities which observation itself presents; and to those who are anxious to make the most of the resources which in each case they may command, these opportunities will prove neither few in number, nor inconsiderable in effect. It is important that all the senses should receive cultivation from the first, should receive simultaneous and well-proportioned cultivation, not merely for the information of which they may be made the vehicle, but also with a view to that training which is first among the duties of an educator, and that development, vigour, keenness and precision which are its rewards; but if some priority is to be allowed, then that sense should receive preference which comes first in the order of natural sensibility. That sense we all know is the eye. The eye is the readiest inlet to the mind. It receives impressions most easily, and such impressions as it does receive, are most vividly and durably imprinted on the mind. Make then the first appeal to the eye of your pupil. Teach him to see. It is no insignificant office, for the results are not insignificant. Nor let it be deemed a needless work. It is indeed a work which the best educated person may with advantage pursue throughout the whole of life, and for want of an early training no few pass through existence as if seeing they saw not. Many qualities of external nature remain veiled to thousands—to the majority of men,—because they were not in their early education taught to use their eyes, or at least were not taught to make that use of the faculty of vision of which, under proper training, it is susceptible. Mrs. Barbauld's admirable story of "Eyes and no Eyes," may be advantageously perused and studied by older pupils than those for whom she specially wrote it.

With Nature then for his guide, the educator is prepared to lay down the subjects which should enter into a course of Popular Education, and in proceeding to do so he will, as we have remarked, have to determine first what those things are which it most concerns a child to know; and let it be premised that we are now speaking, not of the moral but the intellectual education of the young.

What then does it most concern a child to know? Obviously what will most conduce to its preservation and well-being. To preserve and perpetuate its existence "in health and wealth" is its first duty. It is a primary and fundamental duty, taking precedence of others; since others can exist only on condition of its having been fulfilled. And it is a duty which extends throughout existence. It can never be other than a sacred obligation to preserve and prolong life, and to make and keep it full of healthful vigour. It most concerns a child, it most concerns the human being, to know those things then which conduce to its well-being. Nor let it be supposed that either Nature or parents relieve the school of the necessity of giving this instruction. It is true, children pick up crumbs that fall on Nature's lap, and are supplied with instincts which concur for their preservation. And parents undoubtedly convey some useful notions to their children's minds, but so few are they, so mixed with what is incorrect or erroneous, with what is false and baneful, with prejudices and superstitions, that the good is of but a dubious nature. And the information obtained from both these sources depends in all cases too much on chance, both in relation to its kind and its degree; is too vague and unsystematic, and far too scanty, to be safely relied on for the great purposes of self-preservation. We have no alternative but to look to the school;

and the mere mention of the principle which should guide us in determining what things should be taught, brings into prominent relief the utter insufficiency of our prevailing systems. They with their petty modicum of bad intellectual food, do but too generally famish and dwarf the mind of childhood; and are the more rigidly to be proscribed, because by their existence they conceal from the benevolent the real wants of the people. A greatly insufficient provision is in some respects worse than no provision at all. If none existed, the claim would come with a louder voice, and make a more prevailing appeal. But existing educational institutions often serve but to veil the wants which they leave unsupplied.

Now in thinking of what it most concerns a child to know; we shall be led at once to admit what is called Reading, and Writing, but be led also to ascribe to them their proper character. For the most part they are most defectively taught, and are generally rested in as an end. No educational reform would deserve the name, which did not alter the prevailing methods for teaching Reading especially. At present what a painful drudgery is it, and how insignificant the result! We can never sufficiently bewail the actual deficiencies of our popular education. But even in schools where the ability to read and write is communicated, the other error is committed—a grevious error —of resting in them as an end. To teach Reading and Writing is generally the profession, sometimes the well-sustained aim, and almost always the only result, of the better portion of our popular schools. Hence when this is done, all is done which is thought necessary. Hence the choice of manuals is scarcely at all considered; or if considered, considered only in relation to some facility which they afford, or are supposed to afford, for imparting the mere mechanical skill. It is owing to this that our primers contain the unmeaning, silly and unsystematic syllables—words and sentences with which they are filled; and it is also owing to this that the sanctity of the Holy Book is frittered and worn away by the fingers, the tears, the dirt and the ill-tempers of the school. It is owing also in part to this that when there is meaning in the passages which they are, as it is called, taught to read, the scholars are not led to gather up the information, but left to connect their own false conceptions or no ideas at all with the signs and sounds with which they are wearied. In fact, however, Reading and Writing are but means to an end; they are portals to the temple of knowledge. They are imparted, or ought to be imparted, in order to enable the young to become acquainted with those *things* which it most concerns them to know; in other words, those things which conduce to their well-being and happiness. Let them be only regarded in this light, and they will assume a new importance, be treated as a part, as an essential part, of an intellectual training; and be communicated in such a manner as to be made the channels to convey to the mind continually new streams of valuable knowledge. The science of Arithmetic which unquestionably should form a part of popular Education, might have been included in the foregoing remarks; but it is less obviously and indeed in a less marked degree, a channel of information; though this study, which is mainly useful as a mental discipline, and as furnishing a certain skill useful in the business of actual life, might also be made and should be made to some extent, a means of conveying to the mind ideas which have a bearing on human welfare. But if its main use consists in the discipline which it is eminently fitted to give the mind, what shall we say to the unintellectual methods by which attempts are made to teach it? Its very use consists in the appeal which it makes to our reasoning powers, and yet those powers are not appealed to; the terms I use are not too strong. The censure deservedly extends far higher than our primary schools. For the most part boys bring from school no adequate idea whatever of the properties of numbers, no knowledge of the rules, as they are termed, through which they are allowed to pass: nothing but a certain mechanical skill which, except improved by subsequent instruction, is soon lost, leaving little if anything more than the ability to multiply and divide to some extent, and to add and subtract. There are few parents to whose experience I may not safely appeal for the truth of this description. If they have given their minds to the subject, most heads of families in the industrious classes know that, even for the ordinary routine of business, their children have generally to learn after they have left school, the very things which they were sent to school to acquire; nor seldom is what, by courtesy, is designated Education scarcely anything better than a waste of time, of property and perhaps of temper.

Reading, Writing, and Arithmetic, comprise the routine of our better popular schools, yet are we not arrived at the solution of the question—what does it most concern a child to know? History and Geography may prefer their claims, and by some "have their claims allowed." They do not, however, meet the wants of the case. History is a knowledge of what has been done in past ages, and Geography locates the facts which History describes; but a child needs to know what will immediately conduce to his well-being. The question is not what a young person may, in the course of a lengthened education, be led to study, but what it most concerns him to know; and History and Geography are obviously too remote in their sphere, too abstract in their communications, and too inferential in their bearing on actual life, to be eminently fitted for furthering the well-being of a child. It is no doubt a mere question of time—but that in education is a great question. History and Geography I would by no means have passed over. For advanced pupils they contain a deep interest and rich sources of improvement. I require that they should form a part of popular education. At the same time I must also ask that the books by which they are to be communicated should be very different from those which are current. In popular Educational works perhaps no civilized country is inferior to England. Our historical manuals are, scarcely without an exception, either a dry detail of political events, or when any thing more is attempted, a dry detail of facts, accompanied by demoralizing narratives of treacheries, battles, and bloodshed—demoralizing pictures of mere sensual grandeur, false glory, and wicked achievements. They present but one—the bad aspect of humanity. They tell us what it scarcely concerns any one to know,—when kings and queens ascended the throne, or were gathered to their fathers,—when treaties were made which were negociated in bad faith, and designed for the very reverse of their ostensible objects; in a word, they give us only a sketch, a skeleton of the political history of the world; the history of man they leave untold—the history of the causes and consequences of the great movements of the human family, of the rise, spread, decline, and revival of the arts and comforts of civilized life; of the origin and diffusion of the principles of liberty, of knowledge; of the origin and growth of existing institutions, interests, habits of thought, and modes of action; of the relation of the present day to the past, and the obligations under which it lies to the future; of the birth and triumphs of genius, the sacrifices laid on the altar of patriotism; of the martyrs to social and religious honesty, to truth, and freedom of thought; of all that refines and ennobles our kind, and will refine, ennoble, and bless each diligent student;—this history, which is the only true history of man, they leave for the most part untold. Nor let us imagine that such things are beyond the scope of elementary works, and the reach of a child's mind. In school-books of Germany and France, an approach at least is made to render history what it ought to be; and their manuals prove not only more useful but more interesting to children than our wretched compilations,—often manufactured with the scissors, and kept in use by the interest of the booksellers, and the ignorance of the teachers,—can by any possibility be. Yes, let History be studied, and let it be known; but for these purposes it must first be written.

When I was a schoolboy, Geography was taught even in superior schools by rote, and I am afraid that this fresh instance of educational mechanism is not yet by any means wholly exploded. The practice was to learn by heart and repeat a portion of a work termed "Goldsmith's Geography," with little or no reference to maps or globes. The result was nothing but dislike. Geography, as fitted for schools, is in its beginnings eminently a study for the eye, and by the eye should the information which it offers be conveyed to the mind. But our school manuals of Geography are defective in only one degree less than those of History. Where is the occasion, with an adequate teacher, and with the Atlas at hand, for the lists of names with which they are filled? How idle the historical outlines they present. Of what possible use the few words they give on astronomy? It is high time this mixing together of dissimilar branches of knowledge should be discontinued. A system of heterogeneous scraps can neither fill, satisfy, nor invigorate the mind. Geography we should allow to realise its name, and make it in truth a description of the earth—of the surface, that is, of the earth—not a mere catalogue of localities; but in addition to rendering it effectually the science of place, of the portions of the earth occupied by empires, kingdoms, cities, rivers, and mountains, we ought to let it set forth the great features of land and water in each country, the bearing of the mountain ranges, their connection with the rivers, the trend of the land along the shores, the natural curiosities of each more interesting spot, the relation which vegetation, luxuriance or barrenness, bears to the soil, the elevation above the level of the ocean, and to the arts, refinements, and pleasures of life. From being one of the least attractive of studies, it might be converted into a pursuit no less interesting than useful. Deep is the interest which children may soon be led to feel in the origin of fountains, lakes, and rivers,—in all (to them) the mysteries of land and water, whether as presented in the sleepless ocean, or the frozen repose of arctic solitudes, or the mountain heights of Italy, or the richly-covered plains of this garden of England, or the awful depths of western forests, or the luxuriance of oriental vegetation. There needs but an eye open to the countless varieties of the beauties of the earth, and a pen simple but striking in its style, to invest Geography with a value and an attraction of a high character.

Where'er we gaze, around, above, below,
What rainbow tints, what magic charms are found!
Rock, river, forest, mountain, all abound;
And bluest skies that harmonize the whole;
Beneath, the distant torrent's rushing sound
Tells where the volumed cataract doth roll
Between those hanging rocks, that shock yet please the soul.

We have surveyed more than the usual routine of schools and seen reason to conclude that though Reading, Writing, Arithmetic, History and Geography are requisite, and might, with improved instrumentality, be made highly useful at different periods of school instruction, yet that they do not in themselves present that which it most concerns a child to know. On its self-preservation and immediate well-being, they, it is clear, cannot exert any material influence. I would then direct attention to two sources of knowledge as complying less insufficiently with the conditions which have been laid down; the world within the young, and the world around them. I should see reason to begin with the first, and thereby suggest that it should receive first attention, did I not feel that how much soever it concerns man to know his own frame from the earliest period of his existence, yet as its structure and working are veiled under an outward covering, it comes not so immediately under the cognizance of the eye, as the external world. It would be well then for popular instruction to begin with the external world. I do not mean that the science of Natural Philosophy, as such, should be formally introduced, but that simple, detailed, and varied instructions should be given on the most obvious and immediately useful properties of the several objects which fall under the notice, or lie in the sphere of the young. And those who have not made the attempt can have no idea of the amount and variety of information which may thus be conveyed. There is not an article of their dress, their food, their playthings,—there is not a part of their humble dwelling, there is not a season of the day or the year, not a variety of our changeful climate, but might, in skilful hands, be made most valuable and interesting instructors of the young. Each and every object—however common place and familiar—contains its own history—were but a skilful interpreter at hand; and each holds its place in the wide universe of knowledge, has its own laws, as well as numberless connections with rich departments of the domains of science;—in a word, every object around us not only abounds in elements of information, but furnishes an exemplification of some general principle, and may therefore be made to lead onward to the more expanded views and the largest generalisations.

To those to whom this suggestion presents a new view of the duty of a popular educator, it may appear that it requires unattainable skill in him, and extraordinary ability in the young. I do not deny that skill far superior to what teachers at present possess is indispensable; but I must also remark that superior skill is not last among the requirements of educational reform. And when suitable ability is possessed on the part of the teacher, the young will find the study as easy as it is useful. For the most part the required information should be conveyed by word of mouth; or if manuals be used, as I think they ought, they must be employed as auxiliaries. Indeed the proper method will be for the instructor to help the scholars to make discoveries for themselves, by teaching them to use their senses and their mental faculties in observing, marking, declaring, classing and generalising the several properties of the objects submitted to their notice. When this method is pursued with suitable diligence, perseverance, and animation, the study becomes a source of lively interest as well as of varied information. It is a pleasing scene—not the less pleasing when contrasted in the mind with the dull, heavy, lifeless and painful routine of established methods—to witness the eager curiosity, the bright intelligence, the shrewd remarks, the facility of deduction which an enlighted teacher can call forth from a class of children when talking over with them, and leading them to see and point out the qualities and uses of the most ordinary object in nature. The principle of curiosity—that most valuable but ill-used faculty of the young—is thus brought fairly into play, and that too in relation to the very things in which children are wont to take the deepest interest, until their desire to learn and know is quenched by the ignorance or severity of those who ought to be to them the ministers and interpreters of nature. This method of instruction is capable, it is obvious, of wide applications. It may embrace all that the garden, the orchard, the streams, the meadows, and the forest yield for man's use and gratification; it may embrace the substances employed in the arts of civilized life, and no few of the processes by which those substances are converted to our service. The simpler mechanical contrivances, together with the handy work employed in giving them effect, may enter into the sphere of instruction.

Were some such plan of teaching as this adopted, we should no longer have artizans who are blind and passive machines in the hands of those who employ them; or workmen with a little knowledge in one narrow department, but utterly ignorant in every other, how closely connected soever some of them may be with their own pursuits; nor would youths any longer need to pass seven years of the best period of their lives for gaining knowledge, in becoming imperfectly acquainted with some mechanical process, which a well-instructed mind might master in almost as many months. Nor with the prevalence of a general acquaintance with the very things on which human preservation and human subsistence depend—the very things which the arts and comforts of life require—would it be unlikely for the external world to be brought to yield far more service to man than it does, far more of convenience, use, and probably subsistence. There would also be this among other advantages which time does not allow me to specify, that a young person thus possessed of some general notion of the various handicrafts among which he might choose his own pursuit, would have an opportunity of deliberately selecting that which was most in unison with his ability and taste, and judged most likely to afford him a sufficient recompense for his labour. Indeed in discoursing of what it most concerns a youth to know, we must include what he has immediately to do, and no course of popular education would deserve the name of good which did not supply him with something like a set and detailed account of the several branches of honest industry among which circumstances had fixed his choice. For want of this many are passively led into pursuits for which they are found to have neither liking nor aptitude. They therefore soon sink into machines, become disgusted with their employment, and seek in guilty pleasures that incitement which their nature requires, but which the want of education has prevented from being innocent and useful. For myself, I have not the slightest doubt that much of the prevalent intemperance is referrible to the utter want of interest which handicraftsmen commonly labour under in relation to their employments. We can never oppose nature with impunity, and the moment you employ as a machine the being whom Nature has endowed with mental energies, you run the greatest risk of forcing into baneful channels the very powers which were designed for the furtherance of man's highest good. Among the things connected with the world without each individual, which it concerns a child, a youth, and a full grown man to know, not least in importance is a knowledge of the relations which all the members of civilised life sustain to each other. Do not be afraid that I am about to enter on the thorny and dangerous path of party politics. It is a social misfortune that there should be ground for the existence of the term " party politics," and never will men practically know and feel that " party is the madness of the many for the gain of the few," till the great truths of social philosophy are simplified and taught in our popular schools, with the same absence of jealousy and apprehension as attends instruction in the mechanical process of reading and writing. Nor ever will the social system be free from causes of alarm, disturbance, and convulsion, till with a generous reliance on the innate power of truth, and a generous love of every class of the social commonwealth, we train the young to think on the relations they bear, and will bear, and on the duties they owe, and will owe, to those with whom they are associated in civil society. The laws which regulate the production and distribution of wealth—the supply, demand and rewards of labour—the reasons which require the security of property—reasons which bear with more weight on the welfare of the industrious than on that of any other class;—these high concernments admit of being brought within the apprehension of any ordinarily instructed mind, and must—if we would educate for the good of society at large—be ere long introduced into the elementary instruction of our popular schools. Here a wide field opens before me in which I might enlarge—but I am compelled by my limits to turn and ask your attention to the world within each human being.

And surely it must even at the first sight appear strange, that of all things man should be kept most ignorant of himself. To what but chance can we ascribe the determination of the studies of our schools, when we find *that* knowledge altogether neglected which it concerns each one so much to possess. In fact principles have been utterly neglected in education; the science is now only in its birth, and the art can scarcely be said to exist even in embryo. Otherwise surely a knowledge of the human frame and faculties would long since have entered as an essential part into our plans of popular instruction. What has so immediate a bearing on self-preservation—on our welfare, our happiness, on our means for discharging the duties of the parental or the social relations—as a knowledge of the human frame and faculties? And may we not justifiably ascribe no few of the evils which afflict humanity to the prevalent ignorance on this important matter? Men know not the laws of their own being, and therefore they are perpetually violating them, and bringing disorders, disease and ruin on themselves and families. Here is the cause why maternal affection—that holy instinct—is not seldom perverted to the serious injury of the very being for whose preservation against an open attack it would prompt the voluntary sacrifice of life; nor is it a wonder that those who fancy that ardent spirits conduce to their own welfare, should deny themselves, in order to give their infants "a drop of something to do them good." And here is at least a part of the cause why so many of our industrious population undermine their health, strength, and resources, under the influence of the pernicious habit of drinking, which ignorance of the structure of their bodies, and the conditions of its healthful and vigorous action, prevented them from checking and arresting in its birth. The crowd of locusts which cover the land under the assumed dignity of " Doctors," but with all the banefulness of ignorant and artful *quacks*, owe their existence, their continuance, and their ill-gotten gain, to the ignorance of the people respecting the structure and functions of their own bodies. The blow at these and other social evils must be struck in our popular schools. We must teach the young to know themselves—we must lay before them a knowledge of the structure and workings of that frame which is " curiously and fearfully made," and which no one ever looked into carefully but he came away impressed not merely with a pleasing wonder, but also a sentiment of respect to himself and his faculties, and of piety and reverence towards its wise and Almighty Architect. Nor, again, let the novelty of the study create in the mind of any of my readers a false idea of its difficulty. There is a small volume entitled " The House I Live in," for which we are indebted to an intelligent American author—which contains in simple language, language on a level with the understanding of a child—all that is of absolute necessity in popular instruction on the subject, except, indeed, that the illustrations which are here given in rough pictorial sketches, should be presented—when possible—in the visible realities of parts and functions which Nature herself has supplied. If in addition to this the teacher would carefully study the small but excellent Essay on Physiology, published in Chambers' Educational Course, and Combe's most admirable volume on Physiology applied to health, he would not be inadequately furnished for his office in this particular, though nothing can compensate fully for the want of a systematic course of instruction. And here I cannot allow myself to omit the remark that such a knowledge of its own frame as might be communicated even to a child, would be the best foundation on which to lay those religious convictions and impressions which, by connecting man with his Maker, prepare the way not only for a practical acknowledgment of the human brotherhood, but a ready, humble, and self-respecting discharge of the duties of life, and thus prove the most effectual conservators of the high interests of humanity.

It would be very alien from the spirit of my observations, should I omit to require that some knowledge should be communicated to the young, of the nature, workings, and discipline of their mental powers. I do not, of course, propose that the intricacies and darkness of metaphysics should be carried into our schools, nor a spirit of disputation fostered there. What I ask for does not imply this; but a simple and unpretending disclosure to the scholars of the several states in which their mind may exist, the causes of its disorder, the conditions of its health and vigour. Whatever opinion we may entertain of the essence of the mind, of the proximate cause of its faculties, we all agree in receiving as facts certain general laws, a knowledge of which conduces to our well-being; as, for instance, the laws of association, of habit, of memory; the laws which regard the regulation and refinement of the affections, which guide us in the quest and discovery of truth, and which connect together, by a reciprocal influence, the external act and the internal feeling. Nor would it be difficult for a skilful teacher to put the great facts which it most concerns the young to know respecting their own faculties, in so simple and striking a light, as that they would make their way to any tolerably well-prepared mind. The effort has been made, and no small success reaped in a school in *Boston, New England,* where, however, both the advantage and the success of the plan were lessened by the mysticism which was accidentally blended with the instructions. And surely when we consider that the intellect and the affections are the masters and rulers of each human being; that far more than all other mortal influences, they shape the character and determine the happiness; that for want of self-knowledge and self-control, the noble energies which lie folded up in man, are either left undeveloped, or perverted into causes of evil; and that many, very many, I fear the large majority, pass their lives in either a brutish apathy of mind, or in feverish and baneful excitements;—well may we wish that all were instructed as to the faculties they possess, the happiness of which they are depositories, the means by which their good may be realised, and the possible evil averted; and require that in a course of popular instruction, the young should be led to study and know themselves, in order that they may be able to direct their course in life agreeably with the pointings of Providence, the dictates of reason, and the impulses of their better affections.

Now unless I am mistaken, there is this peculiarity in the outline of popular instruction which I have sketched, that it not only suggests some of those things which it most concerns the young to know, but also some of those which they will have to do, and which are, at the same time, capable of such expansion as to meet the wants and further the interests of the labourer throughout the period of his earthly existence.

Suppose the child well instructed, for a child, in the qualities of the objects with which he is familiar. Water, for instance, he sees decomposed and resolved into two gases, as well as conducted through its various stages of a solid, a liquid, and vapour. Is there any manual occupation in which this knowledge may not be turned to account? For want of it, how many accidents have happened, how much power has been thrown away, how many fruitless efforts have been made. Or, he is instructed in the composition and resolution of forces, instructed in the best manner, not with formality, not with a parade of science, but in the ordinary routine of daily objects,—led by familiar facts to comprehend the laws of action and reaction;—he is placed at the loom, he enters a factory, he is engaged in a warehouse; and wherever he is, he discovers means to facilitate his labours, to improve his skill, to further his interests, making the contrivances of his head effect much of that which others less fully do by the hard labour of their hands. I do not suppose that every one can be an Arkwright or a Watt; but the rarity of these eminently useful and truly great men I attribute far more to our defective modes of education, than to any grudgingness of Nature. At all events, between these splendid examples of mechanical skill, and the ordinary thousands correctly enough denominated "*hands*"—for heads in the better sense they scarcely have—who fill our factories and other workshops, there is a wide space in which the mechanical knowledge of the school might be advantageously employed in minor but not unimportant improvements.

I may also instance the knowledge of the human body and mind, for which I entreat. This we have seen it concerns the young to know. And have they not to act throughout existence both in, by, and for their minds and their bodies? Is not this a knowledge which expands with the increase of our days and years? When once the mind has been awakened to a sense of its own faculties, and roused to the important duty of controlling and harmonizing their various modes of action, it spontaneously turns its thoughts in upon itself more and more with the lapse of years. And both in the body and the mind, we all know that as the relations, cares, and duties of life come,—as years pass on, and maturity yields to age—so do our wants increase, our need of self-government, our need of a source of satisfaction within ourselves—till in the decline of life—"the sere and yellow leaf"—we are left destitute and barren—a trunk stripped of leaves, branches, and vigour—except there be in us the sap and energy of a well-furnished and well-directed mind.

In fact, the only guarantee we have or can have, that the knowledge we convey to the young will become power, that in teaching them what it most concerns them to know, we are also teaching them what they will have to do, and what will furnish out before them continually fresh sources of light and strength, is in that training of the mind and heart which the intellectual methods I have ventured to suggest can alone impart, and on which I set far more account than on any mere instruction, howsoever well chosen or well communicated. Call forth and invigorate the powers of your pupils, and you have given them the true viaticum of life, the true food of their existence; power to know and power to do whatever they may find needful in any period of their being. It is not one of the least painful features in our actual social evils, that persons who are engaged in labours which have ceased to bring an adequate, and merely furnish the scantiest possible, subsistence, and that only with hard, long and exhausting toil, should not be able to follow the dictates of prudence, quit a falling house, and find or make some other mode of employment. Handloom-weavers I have again and again urged to relinquish their business, and turn their energies to some other pursuit; and as they valued their children's welfare, not at any rate to condemn them to a life of drudgery and half-starvation. In relation to themselves the answer has generally been, that they were unfit for any other skilled labour, how slight soever the skill required. This incapacity comes of our most defective modes of popular Education. Society has been greatly to blame in its entire neglect of the very class which most needed its attention. Call that a paternal government which pampers the few and starves alike the bodies and the minds of the many! I am casting no blame on the past, it were useless to do so. I wish the remark to apply to our own day; and I say that you, and I, and the nation at large, will be grievously to blame—we shall desert some of our most sacred obligations—if we do not make suitable provision for the Education of the People, in order that existing popular evils may be removed from the face of the land which they disgrace, and from our cottages which they trouble and defile. Give the child of the weaver and the children of all our handicraftsmen and our peasantry an education which, by training the mind and furnishing it with useful, really useful knowledge, shall prepare them, when men, not only for the discharge of the duties of the stations which they actually fill, but also for those contingencies or changes which the fickleness of commerce, the ascendancy of individual or party interests, the collisions of nations and classes, are constantly bringing to pass.

J. R. B.

ART. III.—ON RELIGION CONSIDERED WITH RESPECT TO ITS SOURCE, ITS FORMS, AND ITS DEVELOPMENTS. BY M. BENJAMIN CONSTANT. Vol. 2, Book 4, Chap. 11.

Concerning the Jews.

IN expressing our sentiments with regard to the Hebrew priesthood, with a freedom which we have attempted neither to disguise nor soften, it has been far from our intention to attack the religion of Moses itself. We are little disposed to unite ourselves with those who have placed the Jews in the last rank of ancient people, and represented their doctrine as a ferocious and fanatical superstition. The writers of the eighteenth century, who have treated the sacred writings of the Hebrews with a contempt mingled with fury, judged of antiquity in a miserably superficial manner, and of all nations the Jewish is that whose genius and the character of whose religious institutions is the least understood. In order to divert ourselves with Voltaire, at the expense of the books of Ezekiel and Genesis, we must unite two things which render this mirth sufficiently sad; the most profound ignorance, and the most deplorable frivolity. Far from agreeing in this respect with the opinion which became popular at the end of the last century, we regard the Hebrews as very superior to the tribes by which they were surrounded, and even to the despotic empires which reduced them to slavery. We acknowledge, however, what no impartial man can dispute, that their annals are filled with revolting deeds and cruel actions, which we do not pretend to justify. In order to explain this apparent contradiction we shall here lay open all our thoughts, making use of those means by which we attained to our belief. These means are, examination and the study of those records on which this belief is founded, and nothing compels us to conceal the result which this examination has produced on our minds.

If we admit revelation, that is to say, direct and supernatural manifestations of the Divinity to men, we must consider these revelations as assistance granted by a good and powerful being, to one ignorant and weak, when his strength is not sufficient for his improvement in this world.

A light then gleamed through the darkness in which the perplexed traveller was seeking his route. But the end of man is perfection. He can only attain to perfection by his own efforts, by the exercise of his faculties, by the energy of his free will. If he is protected by a wise and benevolent power, which his feelings oblige him to acknowledge, in spite of the doubts conjured up by reason, this power must limit his protection to instructing him by precepts and revealing to him truths proportioned to his intelligence. These manifestations enlighten without enchaining him, they leave him free to avail himself of this guidance in his risks and perils; he may abuse and even renounce it. The war which good and evil carries on within him, his wanderings, his unsuccessful efforts, his errors, and even his crimes, prove nothing against the revelation which has been granted to him. These things are a portion of the conflict which is his lot, and this conflict is his road to perfection. Conducted towards this end by a power which would bring his will under subjection, he would lose the prerogative of freedom; and reduced to the rank of a machine, his perfection would be nothing more than that of mechanism. His improvement would no longer be of a moral nature. The Divinity has confided truth to man, and he must defend, preserve, increase it; such is the mission of his intelligence. But in charging him with this mission He has not changed his nature; He leaves this nature, such as it was, imperfect, subject to error, liable to be deceived in the choice of means to an end, to choose those which are injurious, defective, and even culpable.

Let us apply this system to the revelation of Moses.* We behold its birth in a country abandoned to the grossest superstitions, in the bosom of a tribe regarded as even more impure and ignorant than the rest of the world. Now theism is not compatible with such a degree of ignorance. By what means then did Moses outstrip his age? The honour of his theism has been claimed for Egypt. It has been thought that being son-in-law to an Egyptian priest, he was enabled to acquaint himself with the secret doctrines of the priesthood of this country, and that from them he composed his religion. This opinion appears to us totally erroneous. When we review the various systems of philosophy amongst the barbarous nations, and the mysteries of the Greeks, in which these systems were introduced, we shall have occasion to show how little the theism which in them was mingled with pantheism, resembled the idea of the unity of God, as the Hebrew books present it to us, an idea simple, clear, and establishing moral relations between the Divinity and man. This last characteristic constitutes the essential distinction between these two species of theism. There was nothing but cosmogony in the supreme God of the sacerdotal philosophies. This God was only the reunion of the invisible forces of nature, personified in an abstraction, contradictory as these words appear to be, the confusion of whose attributes was divided amongst the popular divinities; the absence of all particular providence, the want of spirituality and individuality, were its distinctive traits. Indeed from the time of the decline of polytheism, every opinion being introduced into Greece in the form of mysteries, a theism less abstract and more capable of becoming a real religion, was admitted there, not as a dominant system, but as one of the many amongst which each priest had the choice of initiation.

---

* [We take this opportunity of stating, to guard against a charge of inconsistency, that we open our pages to earnest and learned speculations, with whose spirit we sympathize, whether, or not, we rest in their conclusions; and that this Periodical, professing to aid the formation of opinion, the discovery of Truth, is not answerable for discordancies in the views to which it may give publication, but only for the spirit of seriousness and truthfulness in which the elements of judgment are presented.—Ed.]

But this has no resemblance to the theism of Moses, which was anterior by twelve centuries. Moses, with marvellous sagacity, speaks to uncultivated men in a language fitted to them, and yet he rarely suits his doctrine to their gross demands. His concessions consist more of words than of things.* These are but passing clouds which only obscure for an instant his sublime ideas of the Supreme Being. Idle questions and insoluble problems are carefully avoided. The Jewish legislator attempts not to discover, like the priests of Egypt and of India, or the philosophers of Greece, of what substance God is composed, if he exists in extension or without extension, whether he is finite or infinite, whether his existence is eternal and necessary, or if he were the work, at once sudden and permanent, of an inexplicable will. The prophet of Mount Sinai escapes all these extravagances of a diseased imagination, which spread over the popular worship, dispensed by the priest to the multitude, a varnish alternately revolting and ridiculous; and these never-ending subtilties have precipitated the philosophical theism of India into a labyrinth of which the inevitable termination must be either atheism or pantheism; atheism, being forced to maintain its ground by negation only, can, by argument, transform Divinity itself into a negation; pantheism, since it recognises, under a thousand illusory appearances, but one single substance, absorbs the universe in its author, substitutes for religious feeling an undefined enthusiasm which intoxicates itself with sonorous phrases, and thus deprives religion of all its consoling, affecting, and moral qualities, leaving it at best but an imposing form and a barren majesty. In the account of the creation, to which we must undoubtedly accord the same consideration required by the genius of the East in all recitals of this nature, there is no allusion to an inert and rebellious matter which resists the Creator, nor of a mysterious egg, nor of a giant torn in pieces, nor of an alliance between blind forces and atoms destitute of intelligence, nor of the necessity which enchains the reason, nor of the danger that perplexes it.

---

* We have cited one of these concessions, viz., Jehovah traversing the mangled victims in order to bind himself by oath in Abraham's presence. This ceremony signified that he who violated his oath consented to be torn in pieces like these victims; a singular effect of anthropomorphism, to apply this threatening ceremony to God himself. In this detail we cannot lose sight of a legislator forced to descend to the level of his people. Eichhorn, also, one of the first theologians of Germany, remarks with truth that the people of Moses are constantly below their legislator. (Einleit. zum alt. Testam. i. 7.)

This superiority of the religion of Moses is not limited to its doctrine; it extends even to its rites. Those which the Jewish books prescribe, although they appear to us extraordinary indications of a more advanced civilization, are less sanguinary, less corrupting, less favourable to superstition, than those of the people under subjection to the sacerdotal polytheism.* When we trace the ceremonies, customs, and modes of worship of these people, we always observe the most prominent part to consist of human sacrifices and obscene festivals; the Hebrews are indebted to Moses for their preservation from this double opprobrium.†

---

* The rites of the greater number of the sacerdotal nations were of a kind calculated to accredit the superstitions on which the power of the priests reposed, auguries, explanation of dreams, and conjurations of the dead. The law of Moses repeatedly forbad these appeals of imposture to incredulity. "Neither shall ye use enchantment, nor observe times." Levit. xix. 26. "There shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, or that useth divination, or an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard, or a necromancer." Deut. xviii. 10, 11.

† Voltaire has maintained that the Hebrews did sacrifice human victims: excess of terror and superstition have drawn in every people to these abominable practices; but they never formed a part of the habitual worship of the Hebrews, as of that of India, Egypt, and the Gauls. The law of Moses expressly forbade them. Levit. xx. 23. Deut. xii. 31.

If it came within the province of our subject to examine in detail every part of the law of Moses, we could easily carry out the same superiority on those points which have no direct relation to religion. Whilst we perceive in Persia slavery, tempered by no law or custom, in Egypt constant and unceasing oppression, exercised alternately by the priest and by the king; whilst we vainly seek in these countries, the objects of so much puerile admiration, for some traces of a guarantee for those who were neither priests nor soldiers,—we see in the institutions of Moses seeds of liberty which cannot be mistaken, and which, like his religious doctrine, seem to be placed in reserve for better times. By the side of the legislator appeared a council composed of the elders of the nation, and who deliberated and decided on all important affairs. The only subject that we must except is the doctrine of the Divine Unity, on which Moses tolerated no disputes, and which, in fact, being his principal and even only means of transforming the Hebrews into an independent people, could not be involved in doubt without endangering his whole undertaking. But on every other point Moses consulted the elders of the nation. Exod. iv. 29. Previous to the solemn adoption of a law, he was surrounded by this senate, chosen by the people. Deut. i. 13. This senate decided on war or peace; and in order to make war lawful, the consent of all the Hebrews was required. "Behold, ye are all children of Israel; give here your advice and counsel." Judges xx. 7. It is certainly no small merit in Moses, come out of the land of Egypt, where division into castes was held sacred, to have

We say this with so much the more conviction, that our opinion has been formed slowly, and, so to speak, in spite of ourselves. The appearance and continued existence of Jewish theism in a time and with a people incapable either of conceiving or of preserving the idea, are, in our view, phenomena which cannot be explained by reasoning. It is of little importance that what we call revelation, the teaching of providence, a light granted by his wisdom and goodness, is called by others an innate sentiment and the development of a germ planted in the human soul. The mind which believes in God considers all light to proceed from Him, as well as every thing noble and good within us: and where there is any thing true, noble, and good, there is revelation.

But, in the particular case of Moses, of what was that composed which we call revelation, if not solely of the knowledge of the unity of God, and the religious sanction given by this one God to the duties and moral obligations of men?

The deliverance of the Hebrews from Egyptian slavery, their reunion as an independent nation, their wanderings, and their conquests, are all within the sphere of human events, and should be judged by a human standard.

The undertaking of Moses was undoubtedly noble and gene-

---

rejected this disgraceful institution. It would have been better undoubtedly to have further extended this equality, and to have instituted no privileged priesthood; but the benefit he conferred on his age is indisputable; the moment for the enfranchisement of the human race was not arrived. This enfranchisement has only been proclaimed by the divine author of the Christian law. Even then his successors soon violated his precepts. Moses could not possibly proceed to such a length, and yet if we carefully study the Hebrew books, we shall there see the germ of the more or less distant abolition of the sacerdotal privileges. "After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord." Jer. xxxi. 33, 34. A circumstance which is not inapplicable, and which appears to us to throw great light on the subject of which we are treating, is the freedom which Moses granted to the prophets, even to those not of the sacerdotal order, and it is above all important to remark that he defends this freedom against his most devoted partisans. "And there ran a young man, and told Moses and said, Eldad and Medad do prophecy in the camp. And Joshua the son of Nun, the servant of Moses, one of his young men, answered and said, My lord Moses, forbid them. And Moses said unto him, Enviest thou for my sake? would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put his spirit upon them!" Numb. xi. 27—29. Compare this liberality of sentiment in Moses with the institutions in Egypt, where there was a class of priests called prophets, but derived from the sacerdotal order, and hereditary. In short, a passage of Deuteronomy (xvii. 14), proves that Moses foresaw the monarchy, that is to say, the end of the priestly government. He announces it without disapprobation, and it is in our eyes a new indication that the power of the priests was only a temporary expedient in his plans: but this powerful order makes sport of predictions, and it is not in the power of those who institute it to limit either its authority or duration.

rous, and, in a certain sense it may be said, that to enfranchise his fellow-citizens was a mission emanating from heaven. But this enterprise does not exceed the powers with which our nature has been gifted. Others have attempted it, and have succeeded, as well as Moses.

Still there is no doubt that he always commanded in the name of Jehovah: it was in the name of Jehovah that he inculcated on the Jews humanity, brotherly love, and hospitality even towards the stranger; and it was also in the name of Jehovah that he delivered up the Amorites[*] to the sword, and caused the Midianitish women to be massacred.[†]

But men of an upright mind and honest heart, friends to truth and to religion, ought to distinguish what the peculiarity of the position of Moses obliged him to confound, we will say more, what he might confound, with entire good faith.

After his deep and profound conviction, (and truth, such as it is given to man to conceive, rests entirely on conviction,) Moses regarded as an inspiration from God even the project that he had formed of delivering his fellow-countrymen, of rescuing them from the most humiliating situation,[‡] from the most overwhelming labours,[§] and from those ever newly-invented cruelties which are suggested to oppressors by the suspicions which the oppressed always inspire. The year of his birth had been marked by an execrable act of the policy of those ungrateful masters whom he had served in an expedition[||] against Ethiopia;[¶] a short time after the entirely lawful murder of one of the agents of tyranny[**] associated his interest with his patriotism. He then raised the standard of independence, and the departure from Egypt was the first fruit of his courage and perseverance.[††] But perils of every kind menaced the tribe of which he was the guide and supporter. Timid, indecisive, debased by four hundred and thirty years of a slavery* which pressing dangers and cruel privations made them almost look back upon with regret, they had contracted habits which could not be broken by their hatred against the Egyptians. Moses was kept in constant fear that they would go and demand back their chains, or that, though far from Egypt, they would again become an Egyptian people. The object of all his institutions was to prevent that relapse, and this aim can be equally discerned in his fundamental laws and his most minute regulations. It was impressed upon their garments, presided over their food, directed the labours of the poor, controlled the luxuries of the rich, and even influenced the funerals† of all: and yet this end was but imperfectly attained, and Moses was continually obliged to make concessions which humbled and afflicted him.‡

---

[*] Exodus xxxiii. 1—3. Numbers xxxiii. 50, &c.

[†] Numbers xxxi. 17.

[‡] The Egyptians regarded the Hebrews as unclean. Gen. xliii. 32. Their hatred towards this people was perpetuated from generation to generation. They sent an embassy to Caligula, in order to denounce them. Apion, the grammarian against whom Josephus wrote, was a member of this embassy.

[§] Spencer de Leg. Rit. Hebræor, ii. 20.

[||] According to the generally received opinion, Moses was born the same year in which the order for killing the first-born of the Hebrews was given.

[¶] Eichhorn, Einleit, ii. 236, &c.

[**] Exodus ii. 12.

[††] Was the departure from Egypt voluntary, or was the flight of the Hebrews only the execution of a sentence of banishment? We cannot decide this question. Both of these conjectures are corroborated by weighty testimony. According to an ancient tradition, related by Josephus, the Hebrews, who had been banished by an Egyptian king to the city of Avaris, seized the whole country, under the command of a priest of Osiris, named Tisithes, and afterwards under that of Moses; but being again expelled, they adopted a new religion, and invaded Judea. (Josephus contr. Apion, lib. i.) According to this tradition, attributed to Manetho, Cheremon, or Lysimachus,

---

it was Amenophis who settled the Hebrews at Avaris. They are designated as leprous. Policy urged the Egyptians to deliver their country from the rest of these tribes of shepherds, which were multiplying in a fearful manner; some physical calamity, perhaps, confirmed them in this resolution; and the anxiety which the Hebrews felt to be freed from slavery, facilitated the execution of it. As to the epithet of leprous, which was given to the fugitives, it was probably the effect of national hatred, or equivalent to impure, which the Jews were in their capacity of shepherds, according to Egyptian opinions. (Goerres ii. 467—469.) Herder (Philosophy of History, vol. iii. p. 86) gives some pages of useful information on the establishment and sojourn of the Hebrews in Egypt. Diodorus relates the same fact as Josephus, with other details: " A great plague," says he, " being spread over Egypt, the inhabitants of the country attributed this scourge to some offence committed towards the gods by the strangers professing different religions, and they expelled them all from their country: the greater number of these banished people took possession of a region now called Judea, which was then uninhabited. The name of their chief was Moses, a man remarkable for courage and prudence." (Fragment preserved by Plotinus, and translated by the Abbè Terrasson.) On the other hand, the Bible is explicit, and according to Exodus iii.—xii., it was against Pharaoh's wish that the Hebrews quitted Egypt.

* Exodus xii. 40.

† For example, the Hebrew priests were forbidden to shave their heads, which was an Egyptian custom, or to appear with dishevelled hair, which was the practice of many nations in their funeral ceremonies. Ezekiel xliv. 20. Schmidt de Sacerd. et Sacrif. Ægypt. p. 12.

‡ All the authors who have written on the Jewish religion, with a knowledge of their subject, Philo, Eusebius, Origen, St. Jerome, St. Chrysostom and Maimonides, have acknowledged that great resemblances existed between the customs of the Hebrews and those of Egypt (see on the conformity of the two people, Larcher, Notes on Herodotus, ii. 122). The hereditary institution of Levites amongst their rulers was exactly parallel to the sacerdotal caste which governed together with their assistants. (Schmidt, de Sacerd. et Sacrif. Ægypt. p. 8.) The emissary ox of the one people was the exact type of the emissary he-goat of the other. (Larch. loc. cit. 135.) Kircher proves (Œd. Æg. 1, 300.) that the worship of the golden calf was a reminiscence of Apis. The oracle of the Jews, known by the name of Bat-Kol, or daughter of the voice, was founded on the omens which the Egyptians drew from the voices of the children, who sung whilst playing before the stable of their sacred ox. (Jablonsk. Panth. Æg.) Josephus reproaches the Egyptian Apion with attacking, without being aware of it, the ancient ceremonies of his own country, whilst insulting those of the Hebrews. (De Antiquit. Gent. Judaic. ap. Origen. contr. Cels.) Many

Whilst he was preparing for victories in the countries he was obliged to invade, it was necessary for him to maintain a conquest, more difficult because it might escape him every instant. Hence arose the necessity of isolating his people both from the recollections of the past and the seductions of the present.* Hence the severe laws against the vanquished, more numerous than their conquerors;† and hence also the severe chastisements inflicted on the Jews who returned to idolatry. More indulgence towards the first transgressors would have led to the alteration and destruction of the Jewish nationality; less rigour towards subsequent offenders would have effaced from their minds every vestige of a theism which was disproportionate to their light, and which nevertheless was their sole distinctive characteristic, their only point of cohesion. But it is evident that revelation properly so called, the act of the supreme power, ma-

---

Greek and Latin writers have confounded the rites of the two nations, so great was their resemblance. (Schmidt, loc. cit.) This similitude, so opposed to the manifest intention of Moses, has often embarrassed theologians. It was the will of God, says St. Philip, (Monarchie des Hebreux,) to receive the homage of his people, whatever might be its price. In the institution of the Mosaic rites, says Spencer, God appears to have been constrained and compelled by a kind of necessity which led him on almost in spite of himself. (Spencer, de leg. rit. Hæb. i. 196.)

* "Israel then shall dwell in safety alone." Deut. xxxiii. 28. Gen. xliii. 32. "I am the Lord your God, which have separated you from other people, and ye shall be holy unto me." Levit. xx. 24, 25, 26. The greater number of the ritual laws of the Hebrews ended in these words:—"Observe this law, for it is a sign between you and me." Exod. xxxi. 13. "After the doings of the land of Egypt, wherein ye dwelt, shall ye not do: and after the doings of the land of Canaan, whither I bring you, shall ye not do: neither shall ye walk in their ordinances." Levit. xviii. 3, &c. It is easy to perceive the intention of Moses in assigning particular places for sacrifices and pronouncing punishment against those who offered them elsewhere. Even in that part of the laws which relate to the causes of impurity, and which was manifestly borrowed from, or in imitation of, those of Egypt, the legislator still seeks for lines of separation. (Spencer, i. 115—195.) This explains the thousand interdictions which appear arbitrary, such as the prohibition to sow seed in their vineyard, to dress the kid in its mother's milk, to eat raw flesh, &c, &c. Deut. xxii. 9, &c. All these prohibitions were occasioned by some custom of the neighbouring nations; it is the same with respect to the labourer's being forbidden to use both an ox and an ass. Should our readers wish to see in detail how marked this aim is in the Mosaic laws, we refer them to the treatise of Spencer which we have quoted, i. 277, 587.

† It is to be remarked that in these rigorous measures, Moses has nearly always necessity for his excuse. Condemned to conquer the land on which they subsisted, the Hebrews were obliged to destroy the tribes who, recovering from their first panic and reuniting against them, would, sooner or later, have been their destruction. Devastation, then, inevitably marched with conquest. Every other people would have done as they did. It is not the religion of Moses, but his position that should be accused. But Moses foresaw the period when more mercy might be exercised. "When thou comest nigh unto a city to fight against it, then proclaim peace unto it. And it shall be, if it make thee answer of peace, and open unto thee, then it shall be, that all the people that is found therein shall be tributaries unto thee, and they shall serve thee." Deut. xx. 10, 11. The chiefs and Hebrew priests, who supplied the place of Moses, were much more unmerciful than he was. Samuel surpassed him in inflexibility and barbarity. It has been said that an ever increasing excess of cruelty and intolerance is agreeable to a priesthood, when once constituted.

nifesting himself to man in order to explain his existence, and to clothe his duties with a religious sanction, had nothing in common with these means of a legislator for governing a people, or of a conqueror to ensure his success.

Moses adopted those means which appeared to him the best to preserve amongst his people, the knowledge of that great truth which is destined one day to unite the human race in a single family. That these means were tinctured by the barbarous manners of an epoch in which the life of man was little respected;* that he has not sufficiently consulted the disproportion between his doctrine, and the light of his countrymen and contemporaries;† that conscious of this disproportion, he

---

* It is indispensable, says the author of one of the best works we possess on the laws of Moses, (M. Salvador,) under pain of committing the greatest errors, to distinguish what the legislator has willed and done, from what has been effected at a later period; his principles, from the application of them dictated by circumstances, and the actions produced by the barbarity of the times. (Loi de Moyse, ou Syst. polit. et relig. des Hebreux, avant propos.)

† The disproportion which existed between the pure theism of Moses, and the state of civilization of the Hebrews, was the principal cause of the dissensions which agitated this people, and of the crimes which are related in their annals; history offers nowhere so striking an example of the consequences of total disagreement between institutions and ideas. The subject is worthy of some development, which we will introduce in this note. Notwithstanding the formal instructions of Moses, the Jews at first conceived of the unity of God as only a relative unity. By the side of Jehovah whom they adored, they acknowledged gods at enmity with him: they detested, but still believed on them. Jehovah, in their conception, was only a tutelary divinity, who, dwelling, combating, journeying with his defenders and partaking their enmities, treated the strange gods as odious competitors, as rivals of whom he was jealous, whose altars he wished to overthrow in order to elevate his own, and whose followers he would destroy to make room for his own people. (Meiners, Com. Soc. Gœtting. i. 93.)

But even when Moses appears to have discarded this circumscribed notion, even when pure theism was proclaimed, all classes departed from it, the kings as well as their people, the people as well as their chiefs. Let us refer to the observations of one of the most religious theologians of England on this subject. "If we observe the manners of the people, as recorded in sacred history, we shall find that they were devoting themselves to day to God, to-morrow to idols, and that God had no sooner beheaded the hydra of Egyptian superstition, than the monstrous heads again sprung up." (Spenc. de leg. rit. Hebr. i. 21.)

Moses caused a brazen serpent to be fabricated, and the Jews worshipped it. Gideon transformed the spoils of his vanquished enemies into a sacerdotal ornament, and the Jews erected it as an object of adoration. (S. Phil. Mon. des Hebreux, 1, 175.) The priest who entered the service of Micah in order to pour incense on the strange gods, was a Levite. Judges xvii. 7. Idolatry re-appeared after Joshua, Othniel and Shamgar. Judges iv. 1; after Barak and after Jair.

The Kings were still more favourable to it. From the third generation, the Hebrew monarchs bowed down before idols. Solomon raised numerous altars to them; under Rehoboam his son, the kingdoms of Israel and Judah were divided. The former was wholly given up to idolatry; and even in Judah, Rehoboam abandoned himself to it. 2 Chronicles xii. 1. And this worship continued during the whole life of that prince. It was the same under Abijah, his son, who vainly reproached his subjects for their senseless worship. 2 Chron. xiii. 1. It is true that Asa returned to the Mosaic law: he destroyed the temples, burnt the groves, and spared not even his own mother. 1 Kings xv. 13; 2 Chron. xv. 16; but seventy-one years after, Joram returned to the worship of the strange gods. Athaliah confirmed their power; Joash prematurely condemned it to a violent struggle to maintain its ground, in consequence of which he was compelled to have recource to excessive rigour; that in order to have faithful guar-

displaced her from her throne, and Jehoiada, the high priest, exterminated all the ministers of the proscribed worship. The king whom he had crowned, soon became unfaithful to him. 2 Chron. xxiv. 18. His successor, fortified by his example, borrowed idols from all parts to worship. 2 Chron. xxv. 14. Azariah again expelled them, but Ahaz introduced them even into the temple at Jerusalem. 2 Chron. xxviii. 23—25. In vain did Hezekiah, his son, break their statues, and deliver up their sacred woods to the axe. 2 Chron. xxix. 1, &c. Manasseh re-established them in all their honours. 2 Chron. xxxiii. 1, &c. The sanctuary, already once defiled, was again polluted by their presence. Manasseh zealously imitated every foreign superstition: he established an oracle, and studied the science of auguries; first amongst the idolatrous kings, he directed persecution against the Mosaic law, caused a great number of the prophets to be killed, and Isaiah to perish, whilst suffering fearful torment. Josiah avenged Jehovah; his rigour was unbounded; the idols were committed to the flames, the bones of the dead disinterred, the priests slain upon their altars; and not content with thus bringing back his own people to the worship of the one God, he extended his ravages to the kingdom of Israel, and exercised the same severity against the living and the dead. 2 Chron. xxxiv. 33. But who would believe it? His own son hastened to re-establish idolatry. The groves re-flourished, the fallen temples again arose, the prophets who struggled against the universal impulse were banished or massacred. Jeremiah xxvi. 26.

Such is the history of theism in that portion of the Jewish people who professed it with the most fidelity. If we turn our attention towards the remainder, we shall see idolatry at its height, the ox Apis being replaced, or represented, by two golden calves (2 Kings x. 29), and all Israel paying them homage, with the exception of some faithful individuals who secretly went to Jerusalem to worship the God of Moses. Thus, amongst the Hebrew monarchs, only three of whom extended their empire over all the nation, the two first professed theism, and the third became idolatrous. After the separation of the two kingdoms, twenty kings reigned over Judah, fourteen of whom gave themselves up to idolatry. Israel had also twenty kings, nineteen of whom worshipped idols, and idolatry had always the popular assent: public sorrow signalized its fall, and cries of joy saluted its return. It is a strange but instructive fact, that the Hebrews only attached themselves to Jehovah whilst they were captives, and had other gods imposed upon them by their masters. Intolerance revolts men, and fails to accomplish the end proposed. But the moment the Jews were freed from their idolatrous tyrants, they ran of their own accord to prostrate themselves at the feet of idols: such is the disadvantage of entire disproportion between institutions and ideas. Imposed by force on barbarous nations, theism itself, this immense instrument of perfection, drew them from their barbarism by the very means which were afterwards employed in its own subversion. Shall we then conclude that Moses was wrong in prematurely establishing the theism with which either an internal or external revelation had made him acquainted? Before deciding this, a great question remains to be resolved. The human mind in its natural progress, only attains to ideas of theism by a process of reasoning which dispels the gross notions which precede this pure, but abstract conception. When this destruction is effected, does there remain sufficient mental energy to embrace theism, and to adopt it as the basis of a new religion? Is it possible for a mind habituated to doubt and overwhelmed by doubts which he cannot resolve, to be penetrated by a deep and lively conviction?

A memorable example offers itself in history, which is not in favour of the affirmative. All belief was effaced, when the new Platonist endeavoured to bestow on man a religious faith which could not be surpassed. They were sincere, studious, eloquent, intrepid; they rejected no means calculated to strike the senses, and captivate the soul, and even called in the aid of the marvellous. What fruit did they reap from all these efforts? Superstition and scepticism.

If such is the case, was it not expedient, and even necessary, that theism should be placed, if we may so speak, in deposit with a special tribe, in order to enlighten the world when it should be capable of receiving and of comprehending it?

dians of the truth, with which his own soul was full, he constituted a priesthood, invested with fearful power, and that this priesthood abused their power,—are all circumstances in the natural order of things, within a sphere strictly human, and have no connection with revelation.

Observe, then, what has been confounded. The spirit of sect has endeavoured to prove, not only that the doctrine of Moses with regard to the Supreme Being emanated from a divine source, but that the Hebrew books were divine even in matters of detail. The facts related by Moses and succeeding writers have not been judged of in the same manner as other historical facts, and according to those rules of morality which are the first and clearest revelations. In these relations they have discerned acts of the celestial will, and they have imposed on themselves the duty of approving that which, in any other circumstances, would have appeared reprehensible, and of praising that which, in the annals of any other people, would have appeared monstrous.* This blind interpretation on the one side, has produced on the other side one equally blind. Our philosophers, enlightened and intelligent men and friends of truth, at least up to the time of their entering the lists, and until the moment when the contest, by rousing their self love, subjected their impartiality to a proof which it but ill sustained, meeting in the Jewish annals with prodigious recitals and horrible actions, have made them the object of their mockery and declamations; and these attacks have provoked apologies which, based on an equally false principle, have too often contained eulogies of crime and of ferocity.

The distinction we have established would have spared the incredulous much cold and puerile raillery, and religious men many contradictions under the weight of which they have always vainly contended. Though the inquisition should rise in arms and the orthodox of every sect menace us with its anathemas, we should certainly not recognize revelation either in massacres, or in reducing cities to ashes, or in tearing children from the breasts of their mothers. In these bloody monuments of a barbarous epoch, we perceive at first that necessity which imposes on a conqueror those cruel laws, which may, perhaps, be excused, but which cannot deserve commendation, and at a later period the jealous and unpitying sacerdotal spirit. We recognize the revelation made to Moses in that part of the Jewish writings in which all the virtues of conjugal and filial love, hospitality towards strangers, chastity, friendship and justice are enforced, qualities which no other system of legislation dignifies with the name of virtues; we find even compassion recommended, though the age for this virtue was not yet come, for this age is Christianity. There is the voice divine; there is the manifestation of heaven upon earth; and it is there only that we cannot be deceived in rendering it homage, because it responds to all our sentiments, ennobles and purifies all our affections, enlarges our ideas, and, even in the midst of barbarism, causes those truths to penetrate the soul, which unassisted reason could not have discovered until a much later period.* But, as we have said before, facts and doctrines have been obstinately confounded. Because the priesthood was constituted at once guardian of the divine law, and compiler of the annals of the nation under subjection to this law, every thing contained in these annals has been declared divine. Because the law of the Jews was holy, it has been considered to cover with its shield every event of the Jewish history.

---

* Grotius, in his Right of Peace and War, cites the massacre of the nations vanquished by the Hebrews, as a rule to be observed and an example to be followed. Asa, Hezekiah, Josiah, cries Bossuet, exterminated the priests and soothsayers. Their zeal spared not the most august persons, nor even their nearest relations . . . Jehu was commended by God for having caused the false prophets of Baal to be put to death, without even sparing one. (Polit. de l'Ecriture Sainte, liv. 7, art. 3, 9e prop.)

It ought at least to have been borne in mind under what circumstances and by whom this history was compiled. It would then have been acknowledged that, arranged at different periods, and always by the Levites, many times destroyed, and particularly after the taking of Jerusalem and the Babylonish captivity,† re-arranged by Ezra,* who was of the sacerdotal race, † and who in his zeal, sharpened by misfortune, exaggerated the severity of the laws of Moses, ‡—the Hebrew books must necessarily have been tinged with a sacerdotal spirit.§ Let us suppose that after many thousand years, when the lapse of ages, with their revolutions, shall have left only some fragments of our annals, there should be found together, as monuments of Christianity, the Gospel and some of those historians of our times of barbarism, or rather baseness, by whom the massacre of the Albigenses, the horrors of the inquisition, the massacre of St. Bartholomew, are considered as acts willed and approved by providence; is it not certain that a sacerdotal corporation, rich with these spoils and arrogating to themselves the monopoly of them, would bend them to the interests of their caste, and highly extolling that which they could not too much exalt, the admirable morality of the Gospel and its gentleness, no less admirable, would also boast of the energy of the inquisitors, and the obedience of the executioners? ||

---

* Of all the ancient systems of legislation, that of Moses, in its theory, which we must separate from the practice, because it was departed from by the priesthood, is incontestably the most hospitable towards strangers and the most humane towards slaves. It is that alone which grants to the third generation of the former admission to the assemblies of the people. Deuter. xxiii. 7, 8. We know with what rigour the Romans refused a share in their political rights to strangers. In the Latin language the same word formerly signified stranger and enemy. The Hebraic legislation is also the only one which gives to the slave any guarantee against the cruelty and avarice of his master. Thus theism, though premature, and disproportioned to all contemporary ideas, had it not been for the influence of the priests who corrupted it, would, from this time, have exerted its beneficial effects, destined as it is at a future day to unite all kingdoms in one nation, and all men as brethren.

† The sacred writings of the Hebrews were deposited in the sanctuary. It was there that Moses caused the book of the law to be placed within the ark of the covenant. Deut. xxxi. 26. Joshua wrote his ordinances in the book which contained the laws of Moses. Joshua xxvi. Samuel, after anointing Saul, consigned to that place the institutions of the new kingdom, that is to say, the conditions imposed on the monarchy by the priesthood, and placed this deposit before the Lord. 1 Samuel x. 25. It is probable that they also registered there the genealogies of the different families to which the Orientals attached so much importance: Micaelis, Laws of Moses, § 51. Now it is positively stated, 2 Kings xxv. 9, that Nebuzaradan, a captain of Nebuchadnezzar, burnt the house of the Lord, with all that it contained, excepting some precious things which they seized, and of which we find in the same passage an enumeration, which does not include the sacred writings. We do not deny that copies of

---

some of these books may have fallen into the hands of particular persons, though the Levites, like all other sacerdotal castes, without scruple, carefully concealed the writings, which ought to have been devoted to the use of the multitude, and every time the chiefs invoked their aid, they caused them to be brought from the recesses of the sanctuary, in order to read them publicly. 2 Esdras viii. 1; ib. xiii. 1. But admitting that these copies did survive the national calamity, they were neither complete nor authentic, and only served as materials for the re-arrangement which Ezra undertook on the return of the Jews from Jerusalem.

* Esdras, a priest of God, restored the law which had been burnt by the Chaldeans in the repositories of the temple. Augustin. de Mir. II.

† 1 Esdras vii. 1—15.

‡ Ezra obliged the Hebrews to send back the foreign women whom they had married during their captivity, and by whom they had children. Ezra x. This was a cruelty which the law of Moses did not prescribe. This law only forbad the Jews to intermarry with the Canaanitish women. Eichhorn, Einleit. zum alt. Testam. ii. 227. In Deuteronomy xxi. 11. there is an express permission for them to marry a stranger and even a captive: " If thou seest among the captives a beautiful woman, and hast a desire unto her, that thou wouldest have her to thy wife; then thou shalt bring her home to thine own house," &c.

§ The sacerdotal spirit which is so conspicuous in the words and writings of the pontiffs, and of the judges and prophets of Judea, suggested to the Albigenses, in the middle ages, a singular error. Supposing two principles, the one good and the other bad, they attributed the New Testament to the first and the Old to the second; and all the rigour exercised in the name of Jehovah, and his being incessantly spoken of as a jealous, terrible and implacable God, visiting the sins of the fathers upon the children even through many generations, served them as a proof of this strange hypothesis.

|| What we here present in the form of a supposition only, is unhappily a reality; those who wish to be convinced of this fact, have only to read the history of the stratagem of Charles IX. against the Huguenots, by Camille Capilupi, one of the court of Pope Gregory XIII. printed at Rome in October 1572, and recently reprinted in France. The author of it says, in express terms, that *it was the will of God* which by the memorable act of the most Christian King against the Huguenots, has re-established the kingdom in its original state of prosperity; that the protestants, being renewed like the heads of the hydra, Charles IX. resolved to obtain by his *dexterity* what he could not procure by force of arms; that animated by a depth of thought

This has actually been the case, and it is with this confusion of ideas, that men have judged of the Hebrew* writings.

and a prudence and resolution above his age, and *guided by the all powerful will of God*, he concluded a peace; that during this interval of tranquillity, he pursued his design, multiplied the demonstrations of peace and forgetfulness of injuries, neglected no means of gaining the entire confidence of the admiral Coligny, gave him the most amicable reception, and in the mean time manifested to His Holiness that he was not unworthy of the title of Most Christian King; that he succeeded in deceiving the whole world; that, through admiral Coligny, he gave the protestants the name of friends, under pretext of accepting their services; that not hoping to re-assemble, at a future time, so many birds in one net, he pressed the marriage of his sister; that fortified by his good intentions, and re-assured by his laudable aim, he fabricated false dispensations; that, in order to continue the delusion, he called Coligny his father; that he caused a murderer, already largely recompensed, to be concealed for the purpose of assassinating Coligny: that the admiral having been wounded, the king testified strong indignation at the attempt; that he placed the admiral's friends around him, in order to have them more completely in his power, in such a manner that not one could escape him; that three thousand protestants were killed, without one drop of catholic blood being spilt, which could not have happened but by a striking miracle of the omnipotent God; that the king caused the women of the court, who had plunged into this abominable heresy, to be assembled, and gave orders that, if they persisted, they should be thrown into the water; that at Lyons, thanks to good order, together with the marvellous and singular prudence of M. de Mandelot, governor of that town, the Huguenots were taken one by one like sheep; that twenty-five thousand dwelt there; that the king caused the Spanish ambassador to be summoned, and told him that his object was to acquaint him with his motives for the smooth words and caresses which he had lavished on the Huguenots; that they must necessarily conclude that this event had taken place *by the will of God*, who, *touched with compassion* (scriptural language) *had visited his people*; that the actors in these cruelties were chosen by the sovereign Redeemer as ministers of His holy will; that what He had effected through their means could only have proceeded from His supreme power; and that on the very night of the matins at Paris, when they had begun to chase from the world the execrable pest of the Huguenots, a thorn which had been long dried up and withered, shot out green branches and put forth flowers.

* See 2 Kings x. 15, &c. "And when he (Jehu) was departed thence (from Samaria), he lighted on Jehonadab, the son of Rechab, coming to meet him: and he saluted him and said to him, Is thine heart right, as my heart is with thy heart? And Jehonadab answered, It is. If it be, give me thine hand. And he gave him his hand; and he took him up to him into the chariot . . . . And Jehu gathered all the people together, and said unto them, Ahab served Baal a little; but Jehu shall serve him much. Now therefore call unto me all the prophets of Baal, all his servants, and all his priests; let none be wanting: for I have a great sacrifice to do to Baal; whosoever shall be wanting, he shall not live. But Jehu did it in subtilty, to the intent that he might destroy the worshippers of Baal. And Jehu said, Proclaim a solemn assembly for Baal. And they proclaimed it. And Jehu sent through all Israel: and all the worshippers of Baal came, so that there was not a man left that came not. And they came into the house of Baal; and the house of Baal was full from one end to another. And he said unto him that was over the vestry, Bring forth vestments for all the worshippers of Baal. And he brought them forth vestments. And Jehu went and Jehonadab the son of Rechab, into the house of Baal, and said unto the worshippers of Baal, Search and look that there be here with you none of the servants of the Lord, but the worshippers of Baal only. And when they went in to offer sacrifices and burnt offerings, Jehu appointed fourscore men without, and said, If any of the men whom I have brought into your hands escape, he that letteth him go, his life shall be for the life of him. And it came to pass as soon as he had made an end of offering the burnt offering, that Jehu said to the guard and to the captains, Go in, and slay them; let none come forth. And they smote them with the edge of the sword;

We have stated our opinion of the manner in which they should be judged. It results from the principle which we adopt, that purity of doctrine is not compromised by culpable actions, which are foreign to it, and that culpable actions are not excused by the purity of a doctrine which does not command them. The Jewish priesthood having obtained possession of those truths, which had been communicated from heaven to Moses, endeavoured to make a monopoly of them in order to bend them to its interests, as more than one pontiff and one Christian monarch have possessed themselves of the Gospel, and laboured to corrupt it. But as Christianity has been quite lost sight of in the massacres committed by priests whilst invoking its author, so Judaism has been entirely disregarded in the outrages ordered by other priests in the name of Jehovah. It is not necessary then to invent absurd sophisms in order to legitimatize horrible crimes. Bossuet, who lauds Samuel for murdering Agag, and the Levites for deposing Osias,* resembles the Italian Capilupi,† and the courtier Pibrac,‡ who tell us of Charles the Ninth's being directed in his hypocrisy and his massacres by the all-powerful will of God.

We shall conclude this chapter with a reflection which appears to us to be a striking one, and which we think must be regarded in the same light by our readers.

There are, undoubtedly, terrible passages in the Jewish religion, and we cannot go through its long annals without marching through blood and over ruins. The world, notwithstanding, owes an immense benefit to Moses.

When, deprived of all belief, desolated by doubt and debased by corruption, the whole earth demanded again a religious worship, and this worship, in consequence of the spread of intelligence, could be no other than theism, that of the Jews served as a standard; and in re-awakening to religion, men were seen to renew their sense of all that is most valuable and noble in life.

and the guard and the captains cast them out, and went to the city of the house of Baal." Then follows the promise, that because Jehu had done well in executing that which was right . . . . . his children of the fourth generation should sit on the throne of Israel.

* Polit. de l'Ecrit. Sainte, liv. vii.

† See note p. 402.

‡ Letters on the Affairs of France. Pibrac's Letter on St. Barthlomew's Day is rather an excuse than a panegyric; between his own work and that of Capilupi, general opinion had pronounced its judgment, and the French pamphleteer took the pen in order to qualify the enthusiastic praise of the Italian writer. Yet Pibrac as well as Capilupi appeals to the example of the Jewish history. "We read in the Bible," says he, "of the massacre of many thousands being ordered by Moses, a person of such dazzling holiness." We cannot calculate to what extent the confusion against which we have contended in this chapter has deranged the ideas of the sincere, and furnished pretexts for the machinations of the perverse.

Marvellous dispensation of the power which decides our destinies! That things which appear to have no connexion with each other, either by their epoch or their nature, should combine at the instant required to direct the human species towards the end which they are destined to attain. Twelve centuries before Plato, Moses embodied theism in such a manner as to preserve this sublime idea until the moment when human intelligence should be capable of conceiving it. Twelve centuries after Moses, Plato so prepared the minds of men, as that in embracing theism they were enabled to receive it purified by the divine author of the Christian religion, and to resist the violent and obstinate endeavours of a numerous body of Jewish converts, who aimed to make the new religion relapse into Judaism. Without Moses, it is probable that all the efforts of philosophy would have ended in plunging the human race into pantheism, or disguised atheism, in which, as we have remarked at the commencement of this chapter, both the religion and philosophy of the Indians are lost. Without Plato, it is possible, humanly speaking, that Christianity, under the oppression of the Judaizing Christians, would have relapsed into a Jewish sect.*

---

* After this explication, which cannot, it appears to us, be accused of reserve or insincerity, we will venture to believe that nothing will be discovered, in our opinion, concerning Judaism, which can separate us from the Christian community to which we belong. We acknowledge the revelation made to Moses; for we cannot otherwise explain the appearance of theism, in a barbarous age and amongst a barbarous people. We acknowledge the Christian revelation: for the regeneration of the human race, sunk in the last degree of political and religious corruption, appears to us equally inexplicable, without the intervention of that power which wills the moral amelioration of men. If, aided by the Scriptures themselves, and by the historical knowledge of the manner in which these Scriptures have been handed down to us, availing ourselves of the right which the first reformers had the inestimable merit of reconquering for all Christians, we differ in our judgment of some few facts; this difference, which destroys not the smallest part of the basis of the belief which we profess, but, on the contrary, removes weighty objections and insoluble difficulties, and avoids all which is inconsistent with the eternal laws of humanity and of justice, is a greater homage to the divinity of the two religions, granted by heaven to the human race, each in its proper time, and in proportion to their wants and weaknesses. Moses and his law are, in our view, as different from the Jewish people and priesthood, as is the divine founder of our religion from those priests who have perverted his celestial words, and from those people who have been misled by a ferocious fanaticism.

A. M. B.

ART. IV.—ON THE MUTUAL RELATIONSHIP EXISTING BETWEEN THE THREE FIRST OR SYNOPTICAL GOSPELS.* BY DR. KARL AUGUST CREDNER.

THE agreement which exists between the three first or Synoptical Gospels, both with regard to the period of the history they each embrace, and to the general plan of arrangement they each observe, cannot possibly escape the notice of the attentive reader. Each Gospel restricts the scene of Jesus's ministry almost exclusively to Galilee, and each Gospel limits its duration to one year. This fact is the more striking when we compare the Synoptical Gospels with that of John, for such comparison shows the agreement to be a chosen and arbitrary one, and by no means a necessary historical accordance.

But it is not a mere general agreement which we discern in the Synoptics; we likewise find—in conjunction, indeed, with much disharmony and discrepancy—a very great correspondence in many of the details and minor incidents of the history. Not only do the narratives frequently occur in the same order of succession, but the very same words and forms of expression are often employed. Yet, in the midst of this harmony—indicating as it does some original relationship between these Gospels—each Gospel has preserved an individuality, a character of its own; each evangelist has apprehended and delineated the history from a peculiar and distinct point of view; each has made selection from the materials at command with freedom and independence: and each has stamped his own style of language upon his work. So that servile dependence and unrestricted freedom, harmony and disharmony, are found in immediate connexion.†

This remarkable mutual relationship did not fail, even in the early ages of the church, to attract the observation of the biblical student; but attention was directed exclusively towards the accordance of the Gospel histories: all disharmony and discrepancy became tortured into harmony, the agreement was declared complete, and was ascribed to the agency of the Holy

---

* From the "Einleitung in das Neue Testament," vol. i. p. 160.

† There are sixty-five passages or paragraphs which are common to all three Gospels; twenty-three which are common to Matthew and Mark, but have no parallel in Luke; thirty-nine common to Matthew and Luke, but have no parallel in Mark; eighteen common to Mark and Luke, but have no parallel in Matthew. There remain thirty-three paragraphs in Matthew, seven in Mark, and forty-two in Luke, which have no parallel in either of the other two Gospels.

Spirit. It was reserved for modern times, after that the theory of inspiration had been modified by the Arminians, to examine this relationship by the torch of historical criticism. And such investigation has given birth to three *principal* hypotheses. These again have received many and various combinations.

I. That the one evangelist copied from the others—the later from the earlier.

The adoption of this theory led to the inquiry respecting the order in which the Gospels were written; and each Gospel became recognised in turn as the most ancient, and to each in succession was the honour ascribed of having served as the original to the others.

II. That all three evangelists derived the materials of their history from one or more common sources, namely, from the apocryphal Greek Gospels and other independent documents of eye-witnesses, or from the so-called original Syro-Chaldaic Gospel.

III. That the evangelists obtained their materials through the medium of oral tradition.

This theory has found the more general acceptance at the present day, but it fails to explain by what means, and through whom, the oral tradition received that limitation respecting the scene and duration of Jesus's ministry, which, according to the Synoptics, we must presuppose it to have obtained.

Every natural explanation of the origin of the mutual relationship existing between the Gospels must be sought within the range of these three hypotheses. Now we find that both Luke, in the introduction to his Gospel,[*] and Papias, when speaking of the evangelical history he compiled,[†] refer to *oral traditions*

---

[*] See Luke i. 1—4. Eusebius says "Luke also himself, in the beginning of his Gospel, hath shewed the cause for which he compiled that history; for he makes it manifest that *because* many had taken in hand to make a declaration of those things which he himself most certainly knew, he judged it necessary to disengage us from the uncertain conjectures made by others, and therefore hath in his own Gospel delivered a most true and firm account of those things, the evidence whereof himself had sufficiently obtained, having been assisted therein both by the company and converse of Paul, and also by his familiarity with the rest of the apostles."—*Euseb. Eccl. Hist.* iii. 24.

[†] "Papias, in his preface to his books, '*An Explication of the Oracles of the Lord*,' does not evidence himself to have been a beholder or an auditor of the holy Apostles, but only that he received the matters of faith from those who were well known to them, which he declares in these words: 'But it shall not be tedious to me, to set down in order, together with my interpretations, those things which I have well learned from the elders. and faithfully remembered, the truth whereof will be confirmed by me. For I delighted not in those who speak much, as most do, but in those that teach the truth; nor in those who recite strange and unusual precepts; but in such as faithfully rehearse the commandments given by the Lord, and which proceed from the truth. Now, if at any time I met with any one that had conversed with the Elders, I made a diligent inquiry after their sayings, what

and to written traditions as the sources whence they gained their materials; and, consequently, it is by an examination into the condition of oral and written traditions in the primitive ages of Christianity that we may hope to arrive at the wished-for solution. For as the Gospel of Luke presents the same appearances in its *general character* with the Gospels of Matthew and of Mark, it is probable that the *general* mutual relationship existing between the Synoptics has one and the same origin in all three Gospels.

We must begin by inquiring in what language these oral and written traditions were composed.

After the conquests of Alexander the Great, a large number of Jews quitted Palestine and established themselves in Alexandria and the Grecian States. Here, even the learned among them—a Philo for example—the more readily forgot their native tongue, it being no longer necessary to them for the satisfying of their religious wants, their sacred records having been translated into Greek. Still the link which bound the Grecian Jews —the Hellenists, as they were called—to their original home remained unbroken. By the Jew, Jerusalem continued to be regarded as his capital; there the existing Sanhedrin was still his highest authority in all matters of religion; and thousands of Jews, whose language was Greek, yearly performed a pilgrimage to the Holy City, in order to pay their vows, and to worship Jehovah, "who dwelleth in Zion," within the walls of their national sanctuary. At this time Palestine had been overrun and subjected first by the Grecians, and afterwards by the Romans, and since the reign of Herod not only had many Greeks, both traders and artisans, found occupation in Palestine, but not a few Greek colonies had located themselves in different towns in the conquered country. To this combination of circumstances may be referred the singular fact that in Palestine, at the time of Jesus, the Greek tongue was very generally understood, whilst an acquaintance with the language proper to the country was possessed almost exclusively by the native Jewish inhabitants; so that it was literally true that almost all who resided in the Holy Land had some knowledge of Greek, whilst many who were domiciliated there did not understand the vernacular dialect.*

Andrew, or what Peter said; or what Philip, or Thomas, or James, or John, or Matthew, or any other of the Lord's disciples were wont to say; and what Aristion and John the Elder (the disciples of our Lord) uttered. For I thought that those things contained in books could not profit me so much as what I heard from the mouths of men yet surviving.'"—*Euseb. Eccl. Hist.* iii. 39.

* At the time of the Romans the Greek language was so common in Palestine

To the more zealous among the Palestinian Jews, this intrusion of the Greek—of a profane tongue—was an abomination; by the rich and the noble the language itself was held in contempt, because it was learned by the native Jew with the express object of making small gains. The slave, the retail dealer, the tax-gatherer, found in a knowledge of Greek a certain means of profit, and on this very account it was an acquirement which the wealthy rejected with proud disdain.* Hence it was, that in Palestine, Greek was far more familiar to the lower classes than to the higher, though the latter could not remain wholly ignorant of a language so much used amongst them.

Jesus and his disciples had sprung from the ranks of the people. They had been carpenters, fishermen, tax-gatherers. We are therefore justified in supposing that they were able to speak Greek. Moreover, they were Galilæans, many of them dwelling on the borders of the Galilæan sea, which was surrounded on all sides by Greek towns.† It is consequently almost inconceivable that they, and more especially Matthew, who was a collector of the customs on that sea, could have remained unacquainted with Greek, which was the universal medium of communication throughout the Roman empire. Besides, we nowhere find the slightest intimation in the Gospels that Jesus, on any occasion, made use of an interpreter, either in his intercourse with those who spoke Greek, or at his trial;‡ and we may therefore conclude that the Evangelists looked upon an acquaintance with Greek as a thing of course.

But though there is much reason to believe that Jesus and his Apostles were able to speak Greek, there is abundant evi-

---

that Cæsar commanded that his legislative decrees should be registered on tables of brass, in *Greek* and in *Latin.* See *Josephus Antiq.* xiv. 10, 2, 3; xiv. 12, 5. *Reiske*, de lingua vernacula Jesu Christi; *Lightfoot*, horæ hebr. ad Matth. i. 23; *Klaeden*, de lingua Jesu Christi vernacula; *Diodati*, de Christo graece loquente exercitatio; *De Rossi*, della lingua propria di Christo; *Zeibich*, de lingua Judæorum tempore Christi et Apost.; *Paulus*, *Wegscheider*, *Wisemann*, *Gieseler*, *Gesenius*.

* "I have also taken great pains to obtain the learning of the Greeks, and understand the elements of the Greek language, although I have so long accustomed myself to speak our own tongue that I cannot pronounce Greek with sufficient exactness: for our nation does not encourage those that learn the languages of many nations, and so adorn their discourses with the smoothness of their periods; *because they look upon this sort of accomplishment as common, not only to all sorts of freemen, but to as many of the servants as please to learn them.*"—*Josephus*, *Antiq.* xx. 11.

† Compare Isaiah viii. 23; 1 Macc. v. 15—23; and Matt. iv. 15. At the time of the Christian era the number of Greeks dwelling in Galilee was very great: Gadara, Hippos, Doris, Tiberias, Cæsarea, Philippi, were all Greek cities situated near the sea of Galilee, and they were all visited by Jesus and his disciples.—See *Josephus*, *Antiq.* xvii. 11, 4; xix. 6, 3; *Wars*, ii. 6, 3; *Life*, 13.

‡ Trials in the Roman courts of justice were always carried on in Greek or in Latin.—See *Francisci Polleti*, *Historia fori Romani*, p. 721. Pilate wrote the superscription in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. Luke xxiii. 38.

dence that the vernacular dialect of the Palestinians,—a corrupted Hebrew, was their language of ordinary communication. Jesus's teachings would have been totally disregarded, and his pretensions to be received as the Messiah would have been treated with universal contempt, had he proclaimed his mission in any other than the sacred language of the Jews. And after Jesus was withdrawn from the scene, and the first Christian church was formed at Jerusalem, the Hebrew naturally continued to be the language used by his disciples, both in their personal intercourse and in their devotional services. In their religious assemblies Jesus—*the Christ*, his life, his acts, his teachings, became the subject of daily converse. Each follower of Jesus eagerly imparted all he knew of his divine Master; the different accounts were compared; the relations of one disciple were confirmed, or corrected by the testimony of others, or by the deciding voice of an Apostle; and in this manner did the discourses of Jesus, and the incidents of his life first gradually acquire the form of a Gospel-history. This original Evangelical history lived in the mouths of the Apostles and first converts, and the language in which these oral scriptures were originally conceived and communicated, could have been no other than the Hebrew of the Palestinians.

The first Christian church was composed of Galilæans. Soon, however, the Hellenists showed themselves far more inclined than the native Jews to embrace the new religion. The large accessions made to the Christian community consisted chiefly of Hellenistic converts—of Jews speaking Greek. It consequently became necessary to translate the oral Gospel, which had hitherto been delivered in Hebrew only, into the Greek tongue. But the Greek into which this spoken Gospel was now rendered was not the copious language of a Thucydides, a Plato, a Demosthenes; nor was it even the already degenerated Greek of a Philo, or a Josephus; on the contrary it was the meagre dialect of poor Jews, whose only teachers were Hellenists, uneducated soldiers and mechanics speaking a corrupted Greek, to whom, at best, the ill-written Alexandrian translation of the Old Testament served as the highest model of Greek composition. A translation coming from such hands, the work of men who placed no value on the elegancies of style, and whose only aim was fidelity and truth, would, of course, be ungrammatical, poor, and awkward.

But the task of translating did not devolve on a single individual; separate portions of the Gospel narrative became rendered into Greek as the occasion demanded. Still, the scantiness of the translators' vocabulary on the one hand, and the eagerness with which all that had been already translated would be made use of on the other, together with the fact that many events in the life of Jesus would be, in the first instance, narrated in Greek, must naturally have tended to give a certain uniformity or fixedness to the translation. Thus would the original Greek oral Gospel, even whilst preached at Jerusalem, before Christianity was propagated beyond the confines of Palestine, have acquired, with regard to its language, a kind of stereotype form; the more readily since the Jews, in conformity with their usual method of interpretation, would have attached great importance to the use of the identical words and expressions of Jesus. And there can be little doubt, that many of those passages and particular phrases, which surprise us by their occurrence, and by their strict accordance in all three Gospels, constituted a part of this oral translation, from whence they were derived by the Evangelists.

But although the original Greek oral Gospel thus, as it were spontaneously in the bosom of the first Christian community, acquired, to a certain extent, a fixedness of form, abundant scope remained for much divergence, and for every sort of license. An orally delivered history could not but be subject to constant variations, especially with respect to minor matters. Sometimes portions would be misapprehended, and sometimes incorrectly heard, or imperfectly remembered. The translation of these oral traditions into another language would, indeed, destroy some of these differences, but it would also unavoidably give rise to others. Errors were quite inevitable in a translation which had only a verbal, and not a written existence.

This spoken Gospel was widely promulgated long before our written Gospels came into being. This relation of eye-witnesses was more detailed and circumstantial,* but it was given without reference to chronological order, particular features in the life and discourses of Jesus being brought forward as the occasion might determine, with express relation to practical application. No cause existed in the earliest age of Christianity which should induce the disciples to attempt the writing down of these Gospel traditions, which lived in the mouths and hearts of the Christians. The want of an authentic written memorial remained long unknown. It was not needed to satisfy any Jewish expectation respecting the Messiah, who should come to fulfil the law and the prophets, and not to deliver a new law, or new Scriptures. Besides it was contrary to the usual practice of the

---

* See John xx. 30, and xxi. 25. With regard to the want of chronological order, see the testimony of Papias. *Euseb. Eccl. Hist.* iii. 39.

Jewish schools for the disciples to write down the discourses of their instructors; it was their habit to treasure them in the memory. To the disciples of Jesus a written record of his life and teachings would have appeared particularly unnecessary, since the first Christians universally expected his speedy reappearance upon earth to establish his kingdom. It is therefore easy to understand why, previous to the destruction of Jerusalem, no trace of any authentic written Gospel can be found. During that period of calamity, however, the interest of private individuals, or the endeavour after the attainment of some special objects might naturally have given occasion to the writing down of certain portions of the Gospel narrative.

The propagation of the Gospel through the medium of oral tradition exclusively, was in the first instance, that is, so long as it was transmitted by the immediate followers of Jesus and his Apostles, favourable to its fullness and its purity. But when, in the course of time, Christianity gained a wider dissemination, and the number of eye-witnesses continually declined, the influence of tradition upon the history became decidedly and increasingly prejudicial. The memory of those who had not been present at the scenes they described constantly failed; the names of persons they had not known, the precise time and place of events they had not witnessed, gradually escaped their recollection. These losses, which were unimportant as far as the teachings of Jesus were concerned, were most liberally replaced—in a manner highly injurious to the history—by the introduction of additions, of interpretations adapted to the ever-varying signs of the times, and of miraculous embellishments. So that, in fact, in the same proportion as the Gospel gained in extension it lost in simplicity and fidelity, continually approximating more and more nearly to the character of a legend. That the oral tradition did gradually receive some chronological arrangement, and that it did actually acquire that general historical order, which the Synoptics indicate, is sufficiently evident both from the prologue to Luke's Gospel, and from the words of Papias in the preface to his Books.*

When now already more than a generation had passed away since Jesus had been parted from his disciples; when all the Apostles,—with perhaps one exception—has disappeared from the stage; when as time went on, the expecting Christians found the coming of their Lord still delayed; when Jerusalem was destroyed, and its destruction, unaccompanied by the anticipated results, had produced great revolutions in the modes of thinking among the Christians,—the want of an authentic written copy of that oral tradition which was on the very verge of transition from the historical to the legendary, was sensibly felt by many; and many took in hand to set forth, in order, a declaration of those things which were most assuredly believed among them.

---

* See note, p. 407.

But the task was a difficult one, requiring such careful and critical investigation as was hardly possible among the Christians of that age. And the work, however faithfully executed, was little likely to obtain the general approval; since the universal recognition of its authority would at once and inevitably restrict the limits of the oral tradition—a restriction to which many would refuse their concurrence. Again it would be objected against any such work, that the Apostles had not considered a written Gospel necessary. Such a work therefore could only have been undertaken as a private concern, and indeed the Gospel of Luke announces itself as such in the prologue. Papias was, as far we have any knowledge, the last *orthodox* writer who attempted a compilation of this kind.

The success of these efforts to produce an authentic written Gospel history must have been very various. There is no reason to question the sincere endeavour of these writers to give a truthful account, but their means and capabilities were very unequal. We have the express testimony of Luke and of Papias that the later writers consulted the MSS. of the earlier; but we know of two documents only belonging to so early a period—to the apostolic age—which could furnish materials for an evangelical history; these were the writings of Matthew and of Mark.

The Apostle Matthew had put together in the Hebrew language τα λογια (*the sayings*), namely, of the Lord.* The author, the language, the title, all indicate the early period at which this manuscript was written. Matthew must have had some special object in view in the compilation of these sentences; why else did he commit them to writing at a time when a written transmission of the Gospel history was not thought of? In what way, too, are we to explain the entire loss of this document by the Christian church, if it had been of general interest? That Matthew had some particular and limited object in this compilation is further shown by its being in Hebrew; indeed there are existing indications that these sayings were compiled altogether in the spirit of the Palestinian Jew Christians.

---

* "Matthew wrote τα λογια in the Hebrew tongue, and every one interpreted them as they were able."—The testimony of Papias, given by *Euseb. Eccl. Hist.* iii. 39.

Such a document, though from the hand of an Apostle, was not suited to a later age; and as a history it was incomplete. But it was well fitted to serve as the ground-work of a Gospel history. Some Palestinian Jew applied himself to the task, taking this manuscript as the foundation of his work, and at the same time calling to his aid the writings of Mark *in their original form,* and the existing oral tradition. The latter lightened the labour of translating; but the freedom he permitted himself to exercise, enabled him to stamp his own peculiar style upon the entire work: and thus originated our first canonical Gospel, with propriety called "according to Matthew."

Some other person made the notices of Mark, the companion of Peter, the ground-work of a Gospel history. These notices had been set down by Mark (probably after the death of Peter) with much fidelity, but without regard to order.* To arrange these notices, and where it seemed desirable or needful to amplify the account given, was the object aimed at in this recomposition, which in its new form was entitled "the Gospel according to Mark."

This recomposition was the occasion of the early disuse and disappearance of the original notices written by Mark.

Luke openly acknowledges his acquaintance with already existing Gospel histories. And it appears that διηγήσεις (historical accounts) were known to him, which did not satisfy him. It is possible that our canonical Gospels of Matthew and Mark were amongst these; but we may assume with far greater confidence that in his inquiry after facts, "the sayings" of Matthew and the notices of Mark did not escape his observation.

Before Luke commenced writing his Gospel he appropriated from both these documents whatever suited his plan, and having made himself completely master of his subject, he allowed himself a certain degree of liberty both with respect to the matter and the language of his history.

The relationship in which the Gospel of Luke stands to our canonical Gospels of Matthew and Mark, is, we think, fully explained by the fact that he made use of these written sources, and also of the existing oral tradition, in the composition of his history.

---

* "This also John the Elder said: 'Mark, being the interpreter of Peter, accurately wrote whatever he remembered; but yet not in that order, wherein Christ either spake or did them: for he was neither a hearer of the Lord's, nor yet his follower; but as I said, he was afterwards conversant with Peter, who preached the doctrine of the Gospel, profitably to those who heard him, but not so as if he would compose a history of the Lord's sayings. Wherefore Mark committed nothing of error, in that he wrote some things so as he had remembered them.'"—Testimony of Papias, *Euseb. Eccl. Hist.* iii. 39. Irenæus says, "After the death of Peter and Paul, Mark delivered to us in writing what Peter had preached."—*Euseb. Eccl. Hist.* v. 8.

From what has been already said, it will be seen that the synoptics could not have been composed till after the destruction of Jerusalem: indeed the contents of the books themselves furnish conclusive evidence* that they could not have received their present form till after that event; though this internal evidence would certainly refer their composition to a time not long subsequent to that period.

E. R. B.

---

* *Paulus, Commentar; Winer; De Wette.*

Art. V. — THE NEW TESTAMENT, TRANSLATED FROM THE TEXT OF J. J. GRIESBACH. By Samuel Sharpe. London: John Green. 1840. 12mo. pp. 505.

There is no undertaking which a man alive to its difficulties would approach with more trembling, than a Translation of the New Testament. It demands the most varied, and in some respects opposite qualifications; the most profound and accurate knowledge combined with the finest perceptions of the religious mind. A literal translator will not meet the exigencies of the occasion. The language in which the early history of Christianity is presented to the modern reader should have an unaffected tone of deepness and grandeur. It should be like the frame in which a picture of one of the "Old Masters" is preserved.

There are also associations of feeling with the Authorized Version, which, except where Truth requires it, are not to be wounded,—for that is not a good Translation which, along with the ideas it presents, calls up a distaste of the manner in which they are presented. Faithfulness of rendering amidst the conflicts of hostile opinions receiving life or death from a text, and the real difficulties that present themselves to the most unprejudiced scholar whose deeper mind Sectarianism never ruffles; grace as well as truth of rendering, preserving all time-hallowed feelings, and conveying the sacred sentiment as well as the just idea,—who is equal to these things?

Complete success in such a task is not possible; a perfect version of the New Testament Scriptures will be the growth of ages, of better, juster, less angry and more Christian times than those in which we live. Meanwhile we welcome every attempt made in an earnest and serious spirit,—every approximation which, though it falls short in many things, is yet in any thing a contribution to the desired result. We are especially hopeful when a layman approaches this great undertaking,—for we expect the freedom and simplicity of a mind drawn by the religious interest, but not pledged to Theology,—that has not taken up arms in defence of a position. We cannot express ourselves satisfied with Mr. Sharpe's Translation. We have many things to object to in it; yet he has the great merit of setting a good example, and of adopting a right method even when he has not himself been able successfully to employ it. There is nothing conventional, artificial, or traditional, much less pompous or affectedly imposing in his work. He never attempts to conceal an uncertain or obscure meaning by the artifices of language. We every where recognize an earnest, simple, unprejudiced spirit, employed in a pure search for the truth.

Our differences with Mr. Sharpe we will present in some detail, before we allow ourselves in any general judgment upon his work.

And first, by way of preliminary, and to get rid at once of our most frequent distress in reading this Translation, Mr. Sharpe seems to have adopted an unfortunate theory respecting the Greek Article, though sense and sound oblige him frequently to neglect it, that wherever it is found in the original text it should be rendered by the definite Article in English,—and that wherever it is wanting in the original text the indefinite article should appear in the English Version. In the first part of this rule Mr. Sharpe may have a foundation of right, for it is contended by great grammarians, such as Winer, that no examples from the New Testament, in which the article is used indefinitely, can be placed beyond all ground of doubt; but even so, the English language differs so entirely from the Greek in its mode of employing the article, that there could not be a greater impropriety in a translator, or more violence committed on an English ear, than to assimilate their idioms. In the second part of the rule, which from his Translation we suppose Mr. Sharpe to have for the most part adopted, it ought to have been recollected that there are other means of making an object definitive than by the use of the article,—and that in such cases the article when superfluous in Greek, is often required in English.

We shall mark by italics some instances of what appears to us a very inappropriate introduction of the English definite by Mr. Sharpe.

Matt. v. 15. " Neither do men light a lamp and put it under *the* bushel, but on the lampstand, and it shineth unto all that are in the house." One would suppose from this, that the bushel and the lampstand were alike well known single and invariable parts of the furniture of an apartment. In the original text the Article is *generic* in its use; and it happens that in English this purpose is served not by the definite but by the indefinite article. We say " a man," not " the man," when we would designate the class; " a bushel," not " the bushel," when we would designate the general idea. Mr. Sharpe has the sanction and authority of Dr. Carpenter's translation in his Harmony of the Gospels,—but we have tried in vain to reconcile ourselves to a form of expression so strange and awkward as the following: "And men do not light a lamp and put it under the measure, but on the stand; and it shineth unto all that are in the house."—p. 60. 2nd ed.

Matt. xii. 29. "Or how can any body enter into *the* Strong One's house, and plunder his goods, unless he first bind the Strong One?" This is one of the supposed instances of the indefinite use of the Article examined by Winer. The meaning evidently is as he states it,—"*any* strong man, a collective designation, or general idea," and would have been exactly expressed in English by the indefinite Article: "How can any one enter into a strong man's house, and plunder his goods, unless he first bind the strong man." In John ii. 25, Mr. Sharpe has himself recognised twice this collective use of the article: "He needed not that anybody should testify about *man*, for he knew what was in *man*." Also 1 Thes. iv. 6, *εν τῳ πραγματι*, *in business*, Mr. Sharpe, following the Received Version, very properly translates, *in any matter*.

Matt. xiii. 25. "And as *the* men [men] slept, his enemy came and sowed weeds among the wheat."

We shall now mark some instances of what appears a very inappropriate introduction of the *indefinite* Article.

Matt. iv. 16. "And to those that sat in *a* place and shadow of death *a* light arose."

Matt. iv. 3. "And the tempter came to him and said, If thou be *a* son of God, command that these stones be made loaves."

Matt. xxvii. 40. "If thou be *a* Son of God, come down from the cross."

Acts xvii. 31. "Because he hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness by *a* Man whom he hath ordained," (*ὡρισε*) literally, "whom he hath *defined*," which we think might have justified in English the definite Article.

Whilst objecting in many respects to Mr. Sharpe's rendering of the article, we must be careful to point out for commendation his invariable translation, *the* Christ.

We shall now present some passages of Mr. Sharpe's Translation, taken from all portions of the New Testament, with which we have not been satisfied; chiefly confining ourselves to those cases in which he departs from the Received Version. In some cases it will only be necessary to mark in italics what we deem the objectionable alteration, as in Matt. iv. 11. "Then the devil leaveth him; and behold angels came *up*, and ministered unto him." Matt. v. 34. "Swear not at all, neither by heaven, for it is God's throne; nor by the earth, for it is a footstool *of his feet*; nor by Jerusalem, for it is *a* city of the great king."

Matt. vi. 34. "Therefore be not over careful for tomorrow; for the morrow will be over careful for the things of itself." The Received Version certainly requires correction in this passage,—but anxiety, not carefulness, is the frame of mind which our Saviour discourages, and which the original word distinctly expresses.

Matt. vii. 3. "And why seest thou the chaff that is in thy brother's eye, but perceivest not the splinter that is in thine own eye." How a man with a splinter in his eye should not perceive it, it is not easy to conceive. It is an unfortunate translation that makes figurative language suggestive of painfully recoiling and inconsistent ideas. There is nothing further intended by the figures employed than a contrast between trifling and serious faults, between the atom and the beam (not the sunbeam, but the *timber* beam), a particle of wood and the whole log. The opposition intended is not between *chaff* and *splinter*, (which might be a questionable matter,) but between a splinter and the whole beam or timber from which it comes. The Received Translation is not only happier, but much more correct than Mr. Sharpe's.

Matt. vii. 13. "Enter ye through the *small* gate." If any alteration is adopted, it ought to be, "Enter ye in through the *narrow* gate."

Matt. viii. 27. "And the men marvelled, saying, 'What (ποταπος) is this man, that even the winds and the sea obey him?'" The Received Version translates correctly, "What manner of man is this," &c.

Matt. ix. 23. "And when Jesus came into the ruler's house, and saw the pipers, and the crowd making a noise, he saith unto them, Leave the place, for the maiden is not dead, but sleepeth."

We cannot conceive for what good reason the unsuitable word "pipers," a word associated only with ludicrous ideas, should be substituted for "minstrels," the picturesque and beautiful, and also perfectly correct, rendering of the Received Version. Surely in such a passage the pedantry of a literal completeness, an anxiety to inform us on what instruments the attendant mourners played, ought not to be the ambition of a Translator. Such information is a poor compensation for an injury to the pathos and sentiment of the passage. We also notice with pain a feeble and unnecessary alteration of the Received Version in the very next words, καὶ κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ. "And they laughed him to scorn," says the Received Version, with great fidelity and spirit. "And they laughed at him," translates Mr. Sharpe. Every body perceives this is inferior in force; it is also inferior in correctness. The word implies to "laugh at in contempt," to "deride."

Matt. xiii. 19. "From every body who heareth the word of the kingdom, and understandeth it not, the Wicked one cometh and snatcheth away what was sown in his heart." Here again the attempt to be literal destroys both the spirit and the English of the passage. "From every body the Wicked one cometh, and snatcheth away," &c., is the construction of Mr. Sharpe's sentence. "In the case of any one who heareth the word and understandeth it not, the Wicked one cometh, and snatcheth away," &c. is the construction of the original.

Matt. xiv. 1—13. We shall give Mr. Sharpe's translation of this passage at length. It contains the greatest number of faults in succession we have any where observed. After the words we consider unhappily or incorrectly translated, we shall place those we would substitute, in brackets.

"At that time Herod the tetrarch heard of the fame of Jesus, and said unto his servants, 'This is John the Baptist; he is risen from the dead; and therefore the mighty works work in him' [mighty powers work in him]. For Herod had laid hold on John, and bound him, and put him in prison for the sake of Herodias the wife of Philip his brother. For John was saying to him, [said to him, *or* was constantly saying to him, kept saying to him, as Dr. Carpenter has it] 'It is not lawful for thee to have her.' And when he wished to have killed him, he feared the crowd [the multitude, the common people] because they held him as a prophet. And when Herod's birthday was kept, the daughter of Herodias danced in the midst [before them, *i. e.*, within the circle of the Court] and pleased Herod. Whereon he promised with an oath to give her whatever she should ask. And she being before taught [instigated, urged on] by her mother, said, 'Give me here the head of John the Baptist on a dish.' And the king was sorry; but for the sake of the oaths, and of those who sat at meat with him, he ordered it to be given. And he sent and beheaded John in the prison. And his head was brought on a dish, and given to the little girl [to the damsel, maiden]; and she brought it to her mother. And his disciples came, and took the body, and buried it; and went and told Jesus. And Jesus when he heard [thereof] departed thence by boat [ship] into a desert place apart; and when the crowd heard [thereof] they followed him on foot through the cities."

In all the alterations we have ventured to make upon this passage, there is only one, the substitution of "damsel" for "little girl," that can be considered merely a matter of taste. All the others are either the corrections of mistakes, or absolutely required by the usage and genius of the English language. A translator should rather give the idiom of the language he translates into, than seek to preserve by a bald literalness, the idiom of the language he translates from.

Matt. xiii. 55. "'Whence hath this man this wisdom, and these powers? Is not this the carpenter's son; is not his mother called Mary, and his brethren James, and John, and Simon, and Judas? And his sisters, are they not all with us? Whence then hath he all these things?' And they found a difficulty in him." An unnecessary departure from the Received Version we cannot approve; but a departure for the worse deserves positive censure. "They found a difficulty in him," expresses no meaning whatever:—it is neither so literal, nor so expressive, as the old though not very happy phrase, "they were offended in him." We find the same unhappy rendering repeated Matt. xv. 12. "Knowest thou that the Pharisees when they heard the word found a difficulty?"

Matt. xv. 5. "But ye say, Whoever shall say to father or mother, whatever thou mightest have owing to thee from me, is a gift, he shall not honour his father or mother." This is very probably the true meaning and construction of the passage. But Mr. Sharpe professes to translate Griesbach's text; and he has here admitted an alteration which Griesbach only alludes to in his note, and not with the strongest mark of probability.

Matt. xv. 22. "And behold, a woman of Canaan, coming out of those parts, cried out unto him, saying, 'Pity me, O Lord, son of David; my daughter is very ill with a demon.'" *ἡ ϑυγάτηρ μοῦ κακῶς δαιμονίζεται.* If Mr. Sharpe wished to attach ridicule to this delicate and difficult subject, which no one who looks into his book can for a moment believe, he could not have more successfully accomplished it. The literal translation of the passage is, "My daughter is a wretched demoniac."

Matt. xxi. 12. "And Jesus went into the Temple of God, and cast out all the buyers and sellers in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the bankers." Mr. Sharpe has substituted the much less appropriate term "banker" for "money-changer" or "broker."

Matt. xxii. 17. "Is it lawful to pay Census to Cæsar or not?" There is no such use of the word "Census" either in Latin or

English. In the New Testament the word has the *secondary* meaning of the "tribute," or "poll-tax" paid by each person whose name was taken in the Census. "To pay Census" is not an English phrase.

Matt. xxvi. 23. "He that dipped his hand with me in the dish, he will betray me." This is not the force of the original, which is properly given in the Received Version, "he that *dippeth* his hand with me in the dish, the same will betray me."

Matt. xxvi. 30. "And when they had sung, [a hymn, ὑμνήσαντες] they went out on to [went forth to] the Mount of Olives. Then saith Jesus unto them, 'All ye will stumble [will be offended, be made to sin] because of me this night; for it is written, *I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered.* But after I am risen I will go before you into Galilee.' And Peter answered and said unto him, 'If all men shall stumble because of thee, [fall away from thee in shame] yet will I never stumble' [fall away from thee]. Jesus said unto him, 'Verily I say unto thee, that this night, before the cock crow, thou wilt deny me thrice.' Peter saith unto him, 'Though I must die with thee, [even if I must die with thee] I will not deny thee.'"

Matt. xxvii. 6. "And the high priests took the pieces of silver, and said, 'It is not lawful to put them into the Corbanan, because it is [they are] the price of blood.'" Why should this word Corbanan, absolutely unintelligible to the English reader, not have its proper translation, "the sacred treasury?"

Matt. xxvii. 28. "And they stripped him, and put on him a scarlet soldier's-cloak." We cannot help feeling that a Translator of the New Testament should be prevented by taste and sentiment from employing such a combination of words. Even in point of correctness it is more than doubtful,—for the χλαμυς was the robe worn by kings, as well as by military officers,—and it was in mockery of his kingly dignity that the robe was put upon Christ; and by referring to St. Mark it is evident that it was "the purple" that was put on Jesus, a mock emblem of royalty.

John i. 3. "In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made through him, and without him was not any thing made that was made." We have no doubt that the translation adopted by Tyndale, Campbell, and others is the true one; "All things were made by *it*, and without *it* was not any thing made that was made."

John i. 5. "And the light shineth in darkness, and the darkness hindered it not." This is a mistake; nor can we perceive what was the temptation to fall into it. The word translated "hindered," καταλαμβανω, never has that meaning; and if it had, it would be inadmissible, as directly contrary to the purport of the passage. "The light shineth in darkness, and the darkness received it not."

John i. 16. "For of his fulness have we all received, and grace for grace." This is also the translation of the Received Version, but it does not convey the force of the original; καὶ χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος. The idea expressed is that of grace *replacing* grace, grace *after* grace, successive and continual grace.

John i. 30. "After me cometh a man who was made before me; for he was before me." This expresses no meaning whatever, unless the barest tautology can be considered one. Perhaps the true rendering is, "After me cometh a man who is before me; for he is my chief."

John vi. 12. "Gather up the *broken meat* that is left, that nothing be lost." John vi. 18. "And the sea arose, as a *hard* wind blew." There is nothing about *meat* in the original of the first of these passages, and we protest against this unnecessary association of meanness and limitation with a sentiment of beautiful and universal application. "Gather up the fragments that remain" is the literal as well as the tasteful rendering; συναγάγετε τὰ περισσεύσαντα κλάσματα. In the second passage, a *hard* wind is improperly substituted for a *great* wind. Let sentiment and taste be shocked if the higher interests of Truth require it; but surely a translator should not go out of his way to offend. We are sorry to be compelled to say this, for there are signs of the best and most truthful spirit in Mr. Sharpe's work.

John x. 30. "I and my father are one thing." This is not English, and not sense. We are at a loss to comprehend how Mr. Sharpe could find it in his heart, without compensating advantage, to spoil such a passage as John xvii. 20, by the following unrelenting repetition of a phrase which the idiom of our language will not endure: "Nor pray I for these only, but also for those that believe on me through their word; that they all may be *one thing*; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be *one thing* in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou hast given to me, I have given to them; that they may be *one thing*, even as we are *one thing*; I in them, and thou in me; that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and lovedst them, as thou lovedst me."

John xi. 11. "Our friend Lazarus is at rest; but I go that I may awake him." "Our friend Lazarus sleepeth," is the rendering that the original justifies, and that the spirit of the passage requires.

John xiii. 10. "He that is washed needeth only to wash his feet, but is all clean." The distinction between a total bathing, and the ablutions of some part of the body, as of the feet, common among the Jews, and required both by their climate and their dress, ought to have been preserved in the translation, as it is plainly marked, by separate words, in the original.

John xiv. 2. "In my Father's house are many rooms." We will not say more of this painful humanizing, than that it is totally unauthorized. "In my Father's house are many mansions," is the literal and the adequate translation.

John xix. 26, 27. "When Jesus therefore saw his mother, and the disciple whom he loved standing by, he saith unto his mother, 'Woman, behold thy son!' Then saith he unto the disciple, 'Behold thy mother!'" This is also the Received Version.

Upon this passage we transcribe Mr. Furness's equally beautiful and just remarks. "The generous affection, the filial love particularly, to which he gave expression on the Cross, reveals the depth of his sensibilities. I beg to observe by the way, that the full beauty of the incident to which I now allude, the manifestation of his concern for his mother, does not appear to have been perceived. In our Version, the passage runs thus: 'When Jesus therefore saw his mother, and the disciple standing by whom he loved, he saith unto his mother, Woman, behold thy son! Then saith he to the disciple, Behold thy mother!' But the slightest glance at the original shows that the words of Jesus were, 'Woman! behold! thy Son!' And when he spoke to John, 'Behold! thy Mother!' The difference between the two readings is more important than it may at first seem. The reading of the common version presents us with a complete sentence, while in the original the utterance of Jesus appears to be broken and ejaculatory. In this case there is a fine and touching accordance between the brief imperfect mode of expression, and the physical condition of the speaker,—a condition of mortal agony.—There is an impression of deliberation and formality produced by the common and erroneous reading of this passage, which does not correspond so naturally with the circumstances."—*Jesus and his Biographers*, p. 395.

Romans viii. 26. "In like wise the spirit also helpeth our weaknesses; for we know not what we should pray for as we ought; but the spirit itself intercedeth for us with unspoken groans [with sighings that cannot be uttered]."

"That deep and heavenly longing," says Tholuck, "which awakens the speechless sigh in the breast of the tempted, is not to man himself a distinct object of apprehension. Arising, however, as it does from the divine spirit within us, God himself knows it better than we."

Verse 27. "And he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the spirit, because it intercedeth with God for the saints, [because it intercedeth for the saints according to God,—*κατὰ θεὸν ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἁγίων*]."

"That in those moments when the soul turns with deepest ardour to its Original, it is not that which is human in man, that rises Godward, but the Divine Spirit in the human breast which seeks to meet God, the profound thinkers of every clime have been aware."—*Tholuck.*

We cannot deny ourselves the pleasure of quoting the following remarks on this passage from the same author :—

"When the Christian, in the hours of his inward agony, has nothing in his breast but speechless sighs which rise up and again expire, the import of these divine heavings of the heart is usually the self emptying surrender of a love melting away in deepest humility. Whatever a love thus divinely self-denying wills, the accomplishment of the Volition is vouchsafed along with it. God understands and answers such sighings of love breathed forth from the divine spirit, for they already contain within themselves heavenly consolation and tranquillity. What the Mystic wants is an objective ground for his faith and affection, and it is this which forms the essential distinction betwixt him and the Christian. Even the Mystic, however, might make the experience we allude to, on the ground of his subjective faith. We have a memorable and sublime evidence of this in the following passage from the Methnewi of Dschelaleddin (*Cod. M.S. Bibl. Reg. Ber.* t. iii. p. 13.) :—

'Allah! was all night long the cry of one oppressed with care,
Till softened was his heart, and sweet became his lips with prayer.
Then near the subtle tempter stole, and spake, Fond babbler, cease,
For not one, *Here am I*, has God ere sent to give the peace.
With sorrow sank the suppliant's heart, and all his senses fled,
But, lo! at midnight, Chiser[*] came, and gently spake and said,
What ails thee now, my child, and whence art thou afraid to pray,
And why thy former love dost thou repent, declare and say.
Ah! cries he, Never once to me spoke God, *Here am I*, son:

---

[*] Name of Elias, whom the Easterns described as the Counsellor of men.

> Cast off, methinks I am, and warned far from his gracious throne.
> To whom Elias, Hear, my Son, the word from God I bear,
> Go tell—he said—Yon mourner sunk in sorrow and despair.
> Each *Lord appear*! thy lips pronounce contains my *Here am I*,
> A special messenger I send beneath thine every sigh.
> Thy love is but a girdle of the love I bear to thee,
> And sleeping in thy *Come, O Lord*, there lies, *Here, Son*, from me.'
> *Bib. Cab.* vol. xii. p. 132."

1 Tim. iii. 16. "A pillar and support of truth, and confessedly great is the mystery of godliness; he who was manifest in flesh, justified in spirit, seen by angels, preached among the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up in glory." The translation of this passage must depend on the reading that is adopted; but, taking Griesbach's reading—to put the whole of the last clause in apposition with the mystery of godliness, is a very awkward, if not impossible construction. We are inclined to think that the following is the Apostle's meaning,—"The pillar and foundation of the Truth, confessedly great, is the mystery of Godliness, (the doctrine into which we have been initiated concerning godliness) which has been disclosed in human form, vindicated in spiritual power, beheld by angels, proclaimed among the nations, believed on in the world, taken up into glory."

1 John iii. 15. "Herein we have known his love because he laid down his life for us; and we ought to lay down our lives for our brethren." The Received Version of this passage is the following: "Hereby perceive we the love *of God*, because he laid down his life for us:" and it is not a little remarkable that Mr. Palfrey, in his "Common Version conformed to Griesbach's standard Greek Text," adopts the same rendering. Mr. Sharpe's version is a decided improvement, though we think still not faithful to the original text: ἐν τούτῳ ἐγνώκαμεν τὴν ἀγάπην, ὅτι ἐκεῖνος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὑτοῦ ἔθηκε. "All agree," says Lücke, "in this, that ἐκεῖνος is to be referred to Christ; but to what τὴν ἀγάπην refers is a contested point. Some copies, and most of the ancient interpreters, supply τοῦ ϑεοῦ, or, as the Syriac Version does, αὐτοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς, and suppose that it means God's love in Christ, according to Rom. v. 8; John iii. 16. But this renders the sentiment incoherent, complicated, and obscure. Others supply, less incoherently and harshly, τοῦ Χριστοῦ after ἀγάπην. But that, too, renders the proposition disjointed. And altogether it is inconceivable, that since the common reading is sound, St. John should not have put either τοῦ ϑεοῦ or τοῦ

Χριστοῦ, if his intention had been to imply either the one or the other. He certainly does so, iv. 8, 16, 17. Since in the preceding, and also in the subsequent passage, the Apostle only speaks of brotherly love, it is most natural to suppose that here, too, the ἀγάπη itself is meant, and thus to complete the proposition: "By this—by the example of Jesus—we have learned to know, and we do recognize Love, what is true and perfect brotherly Love."*

1 John v. 18—21. "We know that whoever is born of God sinneth not; but he that is born of God keepeth himself, and the Wicked One toucheth him not. We know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness. We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us understanding, that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life. Children, keep yourselves from the idols." In this translation, as in the Received Version, the construction would imply that Jesus Christ was the true God and eternal life. But this is not the meaning. Lücke gives the following rendering; "But we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us such discernment that we can recognize the true God; and also that through his Son Jesus Christ we are united with the true God; this is the true God, and this is eternal life. My children, guard yourselves against idols." We transcribe a note from this eminently learned and orthodox commentator. "Let us suppose that St. John intended to designate Christ as αληθινὸς ϑεὸς, for what reason does he introduce that designation in this particular place? Are we to suppose that, without demonstration, without preparation of any kind, nay, even contrary to the nearest context, he introduced such an important, and with him unusual proposition, in such an equivocal form, as a straggler at the end of the Epistle—that he did so introduce a proposition, to which nothing resembling occurs in the whole Epistle, and to which no satisfactory clue is to be found in the Gospel, which mentions as ϑεὸς only the Λογος in Christ, always speaks of the Christ who appeared in the flesh, as υἱὸς τοῦ ϑεοῦ, and says of the Father of Jesus Christ, John xvii. 3, that he is the only true God, μόνος ἀληθινὸς ϑεὸς? Never! And the warning against idols, plain and well grounded as it appears, if οὗτος is referred to God, how obscure and unconnected, nay, how confused must it appear to the reader, when, besides God, Christ also is mentioned as ὁ ἀληθινὸς ϑεός!

---

* Thus Bengel expressed it: τὴν αγάπην, amoris naturam. And Beausobre: voici le vrai charactère de la charité.

"These are sufficient grounds for declaring, that the only right construction is to refer οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀληθινὸς ϑεὸς to God. The proposition and construction are to be resolved and explained according to the analogy of John xvii. 3.—And the meaning of the entire proposition is: This (he, in whom we are through his Son) is the only *true God,* and in this only (in the knowledge of him, and in the communion with him through the Son,) consists eternal life. Beware of idols."—*Bib. Cab.* vol. xv. p. 292.

We have now the far more agreeable task of stating our humble opinion that Mr. Sharpe has introduced several improvements into his translation, and given some passages with great truthfulness and effect. We would refer particularly to his more accurate rendering of single words, such as "Teacher" for "Master," and "Slave" for "Servant," though in this latter case we have with a struggle sacrificed to fidelity. We would also instance the force that is given to particles, by avoiding the use of obsolete forms. "And straightway Jesus stretched forth his hand, and caught him, and saith unto him, 'O thou of little faith, *why* didst thou doubt?'" How much more living and real this is, than "wherefore didst thou doubt?"

As an instance of more faithful rendering we select Acts ii. 47. "And the Lord added to the church daily such as were saved." In our Version the passage stands thus: "And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved." We believe the true meaning of the passage is, that God added to the church such as were in a right moral state, a state which led to the reception of Christianity. Mr. Blanco White, in a note to the second edition of his "Heresy and Orthodoxy," has given two instances from Plutarch and Theognis of this use of the word translated "saved."

We give another instance of an improvement introduced into the text, which has generally been left for explanation in a note. The first part of the passage, however, is, we think, incorrectly given. Matt. ix. 16, 17. "No man putteth a patch of new cloth on an old cloak; for it taketh its wholeness from the cloak [*lit.* for that which is put in to fill up taketh from the cloak], and the rent becometh worse. Neither do they put new wine into old skins; else the skins burst and the wine runneth out, and the skins perish. But they put new wine into new skins, and both are saved."

John xvii. 12. "While I was with them in the world, I kept them in thy name; those whom thou gavest to me I have *guarded,* and none of them is lost but the son of perdition." This is at once more correct and more forcible than the Authorized Version.

We have freely remarked upon the blemishes of this Translation; but we are far from being insensible to its merits, of which we have expressed our general acknowledgment, and given some specimens. For an attempt to present to us the New Testament Scriptures with freshness and fidelity from an approved Text, we cordially thank its Author, to whom such labours are in the highest degree honourable. Future translators will look into Mr. Sharpe's work with profit, and receive hints even where they do not follow him. We are confident that when, in this matter, "that which is perfect is come," he will be among the most willing, that "that which is imperfect" should "pass away."

J. H. T.

ART. VI.—SPAIN.

(*Continued.*)

L'Espagne sous Ferdinand, par Le Marquis de Custine. Paris 1838.

THE organ at Seville is one of the finest in Europe.

Who can hear the voice of the organ, as of a rushing mighty wind, rolling through the arches of a gothic cathedral, during the pauses of the mass, incense clouding the dim altar, surrounded by gorgeous clothed priests, who can hear its deep, religious music, without emotion?

It is in the dedication of the nobler arts, to the service of the most high God, that we think the Catholic religion appears to the truest advantage. Perhaps the world is now too far advanced even for this—the very vastness of the idea, as we approach to juster notions of the almighty in his immensity, and endeavour to realise that conception as a fact, makes the best efforts of mortal genius appear so infinitely puerile and insignificant in the comparison, that we dare no longer offer them to our Creator—we feel that the more deep sublime of moral devotion and sincerity,—the secret reverence of the inner soul of man; the still worship of the spirit in truth,—can alone be worthily offered to the great creator of all things.

But the arts, there is little doubt, suffer materially from this advance in the universal mind; that noble simplicity, that devout inspiration drawn from "Siloam's fount that flowed fast by the oracle of God," is no more; Raphael and Milton are no more; Artists, no longer, like Reubens, dedicate, with a sort of noble childishness, the finest fruits of their genius to adorn the altarpiece where they were baptized. The deep religious faith and sentiment which breathes in these noble pictures of apostles, saints and martyrs, has given place to a painting without faith, a search for effect in place of a sentiment of sublimity and devotion; the egotistical desire to excel; the study of Art has succeeded to the awe-struck adoration of grandeur and beauty.

In the chapel of the kings are to be seen the tombs of Alphonso the sage, and of his father St. Ferdinand; and near them lie the ashes of Christopher Columbus, that *great* man: this inscription marks the place:—

A Castilla y a Leon,
Mundo nuevò diò Colon.

Brief and imperfect record of that vast and generous spirit.

In one of the side chapels his son lies buried. "La pensée," says the Marquis de Custine, "qui a conçu cette cathèdrale, ne peut tarir, elle nous promèt bien d'autres merveilles, on croit à tout ce qu'il y a de surnaturelle devant un édifice, qui est comme placé entre le ciel et la terre." The most illustrious names of history are engraved upon the floor of this Cathedral, which might justly be called the "Pantheon of Chivalry."

He adds, "The fame of the son of Columbus is extinguished in the brightness of that of the father, their tombs reverse their destiny. To him, who has not given a new world to Spain, a splendid marble tomb has been erected, engraved with a long, pompous, and somewhat tedious inscription. The name of his father might have sufficed him, mais voilà comme la vanité tâche de supplier à la fierté."

We do not translate the last sentence; there is no English word answering to fierté.

It is not pride, it is not dignity, it is not magnanimity: things make words—we want both the word and the thing in England. Fierté might be defined, a just sense of the value of things—rather an indifference to what is, in itself, trivial, worthless, and mean—than a sense of personal importance. An appreciation of the truly excellent, rather than a sense of superiority, it would have taught the son of Columbus to value such a father, and such a home, beyond all the titles, grandeurs, gold, and jewels, which king or kayser could have showered down. The French have a name for this sentiment, and they possess the thing in a far greater degree than we do: it is one of the best gifts their great revolution has left them. It is impossible not to be struck with a something in France that we have not, and that we want; a sense of the true dignity of man, as man—a contemptuous indifference to the titles, and the splendours, and the riches, of those who have nothing else to recommend them. The French may be greedy, interested, and vain—and so they are—but the tradesman behind his counter, and the gardener with his spade, esteems himself a man—and, man to man, as good as yourself; and he reserves his adoration and his knee-bending, for the artist, the poet, the musician, the man of genius, whom he can *not* equal. The humblest *couturière* who plies her needle for twenty sols a-day—must and will have her imagination and her taste gratified. She throws down her work at the appointed hour, to the theatre she will go to weep at l'Ambassadrie, or to rejoice in the Postillon, or Robert le Diable—your dress is thrown aside—she will not *slave* out her soul and body for you, who are no better than herself—why should not a lady rather want a dress, than she want her recreation and her rest: the lady may threaten, but the *couturière* has *l'âme fière,* and she will go without her bread rather than without her just portion of liberty and enjoyment. Would not something of this spirit be well introduced into those dingy apartments where the pale assistants of our modistes toil day after day, and, alas! night after night? not alone for bread, but to gratify their lady customers with the appointed dress at the appointed moment. The thirst for riches, and the pride of riches, is an evil; but the mean, contemptible subservience to riches in those who do not possess them, and the base shame for an honest poverty, are the still greater banes of English society.

A long digression—but we intend to return yet again to the subject a little further on.

The walls of the chapels, which project on all sides from the aisles of the cathedral, are covered with pictures. The riches in this respect are almost inappreciable.

> "These pictures, of extraordinary merit and beauty, are mostly by artists whose names even have scarcely reached beyond the Pyrenees, Campana, the master of Murillo, Valdes, Cano, Zubaran, are among the giants of this nation of unknown artists, 'ce peuple d'artistes ignorés.'"

Of Murillo the Marquis speaks with an enthusiasm that is never exhausted.

> "We particularly admired this master of colouring in the chapter-house, in itself a chef d'œuvre of taste and elegance, vaulted and covered with gold and ornaments in the richest and purest style. This hall contains two or three splendid Murillos; a Madonna and two Saints are among his choicest productions.
>
> "But these pictures struck me less than one by the same master, which happened at this time to be placed in one of the sacristies, for the convenience of a young artist, who was copying it, and where it received a better light than in the church. I could here examine it at my ease.
>
> "The subject was a guardian angel conducting a young child to heaven; with one hand the angel is pointing to the glories beyond, prepared for the soul of the blessed one; but the eyes do not follow the hand, they are bent upon the child with an expression of angelic care, almost anxiety. The countenance of the young being he is conducting beams with sweet and innocent tranquillity,—a peaceful unconsciousness of the dread circumstances through which he is passing. This young creature, guarded in peace by the benign angelic power, knows not whence he comes, nor whither he goes—for him there is neither fear nor expectation, regret nor remembrance: existence, pure, sweet existence, is enough. It is the ideal of infancy. Ignorant what it is to

suffer, life and enjoyment are to him as one. Not only has he escaped anxiety, he knows not that there is such a thing as sorrow. He sails in the blue ether as borne through a flowery meadow, inhales with joy the pure air of liberty, and dreams not of the bonds of clay. This perfect security of innocence soaring to the supreme beatitude, granted as a free boon and not as a recompense,—this bliss, unalloyed by fear or doubt, even at the moment of its final destiny, shows the genius of the painter. The children of Raphael think too much. Murillo alone has known how to paint childhood in its divinity—its divine and pure simplicity. . . But all the mystery of our destiny, all the awful and secret counsels of God, all the dangers of existence, are revealed in the serious tender expression of the angel; in his countenance there is a marked gravity—a deep compassion, an earnest protection, which shows his sense of the condition of humanity, its sorrows, its wants, its dangers; life as it is, fear, death, sorrow. Yet is an expression of calm satisfaction diffused over the face of the divine messenger; the peace of Heaven may be read in his countenance.

" The canvass of Murillo is the mirror of his soul, rich in imagination, in feeling, and in truth; with him this beauteous allegory becomes an existence and a form; and the creation of the imagination attains the reality of truth. Never was poetry more fugitive, more ideal, more metaphysical, so happily adapted to the reality of man's history as by this great and precious master. For him, the difficulties of his art are but the means for effect, to his genius they become only the source of fresh beauty.

" Kneeling before this Angel and Child, I actually shed tears of admiration, exclaiming—' Greatest of Masters! from what wells of inspiration hast thou drawn this wondrous beauty?' Qu'on est heureux d'avoir été Murillo."

" Mais aussi," he adds, and to the sentiment we most heartily respond, " qu'on est heureux d'être voyageur."

And still happier those who, like this amiable man, can preserve the *verve*, the enthusiasm, the exquisite sense of the beautiful, which pervades this book. Precious gifts! which at times almost divert us from the object described by admiration of the warm and generous describer.

He finishes with the reflection—" That whoever has lost a child or witnessed that most touching, most mysterious of human dispensations, the death-bed of a young child, may gather hope and consolation from this divine picture. Murillo was a father, and like a father has he painted it."

He says true; and many of us think too little of these things perhaps; we think too little of the infinite worth of the imagination, that divine attribute of our nature—we crush it, we despise it, we trample it in the dust, we laugh at it, we hold it cheap,—with reality alone shall the wise man have to do—

Beauty, that divine emanation of the all Good—the flood of love and light with which he has bathed his creation—beauty, which is as the face of the divine author—beauty, that gracious superfluity of his benevolence—beauty, that source of calm, of peace, of joy,—beauty, that sheds its sweetness over the tears of sorrow, over the couch of pain, over the most bare of the conditions of life—is called a charm, a shadow, a delusion, a romance,—treated as unworthy the attention of wisdom or virtue.

All this is a grievous, grievous error—a vain rebellion of man in his pride of reason, against the benign law of his Creator. As I sit now writing, and behold the superfluity of exquisite beauty which a few trees beneath my window, waving in a flicking sun and breeze, present, and think that every human creature is so constituted, (for nothing is so universal as the sense of beauty in one form or other,) as to enjoy the pure and sweet pleasure which this little picture at this very instant affords to me; and think of the thousands, and thousands, and thousands, in England, for whom no provision whatsoever to gratify this sense is made; and think of our parks, and our gardens, and our collections of art,—forsaken perhaps by their proud possessors, lost to human eyes, save to some wealthy traveller, who can afford once in half-a-dozen weeks to feast his senses upon them,—and then recollect our immense manufacturing districts, our *deserts of streets*, our swarming artisans, and consider how few, if any, of parks or gardens are laid out for them, and think what a few thousands of pounds in our rich country, and a few hundreds of acres devoted to this purpose, might give them, of the sweet refreshing air, of the genial influences, of the pure peaceful thoughts, which a Sunday walk in such green bowers and pleasant parterres, might afford to the humblest man; when I look on the little Methodist chapel, reared by his contributions, and adorned according to his humble means, testifying to that thirst for the infinite which he gratifies in his simple way, searching for his God, though unable in his sordid wretchedness to discern him in his beauty as well as in his power,—and then think of the noble churches, the pictures, the sculptures, the riches, and the splendour, which the Roman Catholic religion lays open to the imaginative faculties of her very lowest children,—my heart swells with sorrow and indignation. Who can wonder, who ought to wonder, that the restless ungratified spirit heaves and trembles, and beats itself with vain irritation against the arrangements of a society which gives him, it may be bread, but, alas! how dry—a lodging, but denies the cope of heaven,—steam-engines, smoke, noise, confusion, and refuses the peaceful shade, the voice of birds, the refreshing breath of the gales of spring.

The tower of the Giralda, a Moorish erection, is among the ornaments of the cathedral square, and richly ornamented through the whole of its immense elevation; it commands and is visible from the entire city; its summit forming a sort of pedestal on which stands the statue, in gilt bronze, called the Giralda, holding in her hand a palm-branch, said to represent Faith. The ascent to this tower is so gradual, that it is said it may be mounted on horseback. These gradual ascents, something according to the fashion seen in old pictures of the Tower of Babel, form a species of magnificence not uncommon in the vast gothic castles of the Continent. At Amboise there is one, à la Colimaçon, as it is called, which forms an ascent in the interior of a lofty tower, up which, they assure us, and with every appearance of probability, Catherine de Medicis used to drive in her coach and six. The architect of this tower of the Giralda is said to have been the mathematician Al Geber, who gave his name to algebra.

It would be an endless task to number the riches heaped together in the immense pile of this cathedral, this labyrinth of chapels, halls, and sacristies, filled with inappreciable riches in stuffs, carvings, gold, jewels, &c. Saints, the size of life, in solid silver; a golden sun of fifteen feet diameter; wax candles three feet in circumference; silver tabernacles from twelve to fifteen feet in heighth; embroideries, tapestries, brocades, gold, silk, and silver.

> " It is a fairy tale. Confused with an endless succession of magnificence, one leaves a sacristry to enter galleries glittering with gilding, and with their arches carved with extraordinary minuteness and beauty; dazzled with the innumerable multitude of pictures, a case is opened, filled with books, all adorned with the most precious illuminations; some of them are of remote antiquity, and contain miniatures, each of which might deserve a quarter of an hour's examination. Whole shelves are filled with these books, remarkable alike for their venerable antiquity, and for the multitude of paintings which adorn them.
>
> " For myself, I seem to sink under the vast variety of objects, and to lose the power of description—*je reste imbecile d'admiration*—it is as if I stood before Mont Blanc, obliged to note down its inappreciable grandeur, each dome of ice, each needle of rock, each height above height, and to measure the depth of every valley."

And he complains of that fatigue, that death of curiosity, which follows the excitement produced by so vast an object. A fatigue and death of the soul which every traveller feels more or less, not only in a transient journey like this, but on the more grand journey of life,—and for which a few hours' sound sleep is the certain and only remedy.

The first view of Gibraltar is beautifully described by M. De Custine: few people possess, in a higher degree, the art of picturing by words than he does. He is travelling from Tarifa, and he thus opens upon the subject:—

" This tract of country is one of the most magnificent that I have ever beheld: a succession of wild pictures in the style of Salvator and Dominichino. I shall never forget the moment when the rock of Gibraltar first burst upon me. Gibraltar, the Calpe of the ancients, the loftiest of the Pillars of Hercules. But before reaching it I will lead you by the way I passed, which well merits description. It was the morning twilight when we passed the gate of Tarifa, and we began immediately to ascend the rocks which separate this town from the bay of Gibraltar, part of a pretty considerable chain of mountains, which extends to and loses itself in the sea.

" I followed the turning road between the rocks, amid thickets of aloes and cactus, and when the first rays of morning appeared, turned to look upon Africa, the sea, and Tarifa, with the white waves beating upon her winding bay. Continuing the ascent by the road to Algesiras, words cannot describe the variety and splendour of the different views which succeeded one another. Barren solitudes, such as I had traversed the day before, glimpses of the sea, the straits, and the distant mountains of Africa; then the road would cross deep ravines filled with the richest and most luxuriant vegetation. Evergreen oaks of admirable size and form and great age, in their different species—the cork-tree, the ilex, &c., all beautiful: thickets of pistachoes, rhododendrons, oleanders (laurier rose, as the French beautifully call it), buried the shining sand beneath them in a labyrinth of flowers. The children of such a soil ought to have more imagination than the rest of the world; the richness of the vegetation excites the imagination, animates the thoughts, the air is perfumed; the senses surprised; the very song of the birds sounds like something celestial—and why not? Everything surrounding is so beautiful, that the supernatural world scarcely seems unnatural.

" The very names of the distant mountains are at once fabulous and historical: Atlas, Mauritania, the antique world rises to the fancy, in all the inexhaustible beauty with which our associations have clothed her.

" It was about half-way from Tarifa to Algesiras, passing a gorge at the summit of the mountain, that from a sort of natural balustrade, I first beheld Gibraltar. The sun was rising—I saw, or rather I see, for I am writing upon the spot, the bay of Algesiras at my feet, on the right the Apes Hill, upon the coast of Barbary, on the left the town and the rock of Gibraltar—the Calpe of the ancients marking the junction of the waters of the Atlantic and the Mediterranean, Ceuta, on the point of Africa beyond, with the rock of Abila.

> "Before a prospect like this the mind expands, the miseries and the meannesses of real life are forgotten—all that is low or contemptible in thought vanishes. The vastness of the spread beneath our feet, the bounds of the far distant horizon melting in the blue expanse of air—with a vast heap, as it were, fallen from the Alps lying black amidst this sea of radiance—this heap is Gibraltar. The contrast is striking, a black mass upon a plain of gold and azure, inundated by the streaming light which floods around the rock of Calpe, like a spot on the sun, a mass of deepest shadow in a world of fire;—the day has risen upon that part of the plain east of the motionless giant, but has not yet passed the summit of the rock, and the monster reposes in the shade.
>
> "Poussin might paint, but Chateaubriand himself could not describe the effect.
>
> "This dark shadow in the brilliant landscape—this opaque heap in a world of transparency—a monstrous beast—a colossal elephant—a whale if you will—a leviathan sleeping upon the floods—a huge basaltic rock, hurled and forgotten in the war of the Giants."

These accidental effects, as M. De Custine well remarks, form the delights of travelling; had he been one hour later, had the sun passed the rock, the beauty of this admirable picture would have been lost.

> "Had I arrived one hour later, that is at this actual present moment, the whole would have been lost to me, for the prestige ceases the moment the sun has risen above the rock. I might have admired the grandeur of the situation, but its spirit would have been hidden from my eyes. Of such stuff are we made—a shade more or less—an hour sooner or later, the very time passed in attempting to describe, changes the aspect of the most celebrated sites in the world.
>
> " . . . . I am pressed to remount my horse and descend to Algesiras, which lies beneath my feet; but before I obey, I must attempt a word more upon this first apparition of Gibraltar."

It is the colouring of this wonderful picture that he then describes in words fanciful but very graphic.

> "This huge monster, cast in bronze and enchased in the luminous sea, has the heaven of Mauritania above, like a cupola of lapis lazuli, the straits are of emerald, and Calpe stands out from this brilliant background in its deepest shade, like a picture of Rembrandt. Against all the ordinary rules of art the shade is advanced,—but nature is a mighty artist, and always justifies her most hazardous effects.
>
> "I was no longer astonished that the creative imagination of the ancients had painted this terrible mountain as an insurmountable barrier. What renders it doubly singular is, that notwithstanding the immense elevation, it stands isolated amid the seas of sand which surround it; it belongs to no chain of mountains—a tongue of land, imperceptible from its extreme flatness, unites it to the continent, and the sea severs it from

all the world beside—it is a tremendous rock, fallen from heaven, or cast up by mighty forces from the abyss below."

This description shall be concluded by the sentiment with which the author concludes it.

"But to feel the full beauty of a scene like this, a man must acknowledge and love its Author; he must see God in nature, rise to him and adore him, and acknowledge it to be the clothing of the divinity which he is describing."

"Il faut l'amour ou la religion pour gouter la nature,"* says Madame de Stael, or she might have added, the eye of an artist; but doubtless the more exquisite sense of things is denied to him, who, in the matchless beauty which surrounds us, fails to detect the living soul—is not lifted by the contemplation of material beauty, to that hidden, more supreme beauty of which it is the veil—that sees not the unity of the divine mind and purpose, the spiritual beauty of the great Author, which breathes through and animates the whole.

This text might lead far, at present it shall be enough to say that as the perception of unity of design is absolutely necessary to our right enjoyment of works of art, so the extreme beauty of the scene of things in which we live, fails to be properly enjoyed until a design in its author, through it, is penetrated. We look with but a faint sense of pleasure or admiration upon the beautiful landscapes inscribed by a winter's night upon our frosted windows, lovely as the woods and rocks the imagination finds there—vague and unsatisfactory is it after all, a beautiful confusion of images signifying nothing. Who listens to a piece of music for the first time, of which he does not comprehend the scope or design,—let him compare his pleasure with that which he feels when penetrating the intention of the composer, he follows him through all the long-drawn links of his harmony. And so is this world; beautiful it must appear to all, but how different is the sense of that beauty to one who looks upon all as flung together before him by a power neither heeded nor perceived, and to him who, tracing a plan of the great Architect, perceives the beauty of unity and design in the midst of endless variety, and forms some faint idea of the conceptions of the mighty Author through the mazes of his ineffable workmanship.

After enduring much of the vexatious trouble which it pleases man, in his wisdom, to inflict upon man, in the shape of custom-house officers, M. de Custine, his imagination lifted and exalted, enters within the English lines at Gibraltar; and he feels sensibly, what every person of imagination must, we fear, and does feel, on entering within the prosaic circle of our habits and manners. This noble giant of bronze, his beast of the Apocalypse, he finds covered at its base with pretty Hampstead villas, tilburies, and dandies, smart officers, and yet smarter ladies, grooms, butchers' boys, and nursery-maids. His distress and vexation are whimsical and entertaining; yet who of any feeling but has felt, with pain and anguish of spirit, something of the same kind on returning to this society of ours.

---

* Love or religion are necessary to the enjoyment of nature.

Vulgarity—that comprehensive word—expresses in the copious ugliness of its meaning, that of which all more or less complain. It is not rudeness, it is not poverty, it is not barbarism, a coarse exterior, or uncultivated aspect. The Russian boor, the Neapolitan lazzaroni, the French *prolétaire*, the Irish beggar, the Indian savage, the poor negro himself, have it not in the extremity of their destitution; it is a property belonging to ourselves; and, except the Americans, who in this article have enhanced upon their Saxon origin, and perhaps the Dutch, we are, without doubt, the vulgarest nation upon the face of the earth—and why? It would take a pretty long paper to answer fully that question, but one of the causes of our vulgarity may be touched upon—our vulgar purse-pride.

Except the Americans, with their "social position," their Chesnut-street and their Walnut-street grades of gentility, there is not a nation upon earth with so much vulgar, ridiculous, exclusive pride, as the English—a pride founded upon the lowest and basest distinctions, not upon what a man is, not upon what he hath achieved, he or his ancestors before him, but simply upon wealth, and wealth in its most grovelling form; not lavished in monuments of magnificence, utility, or piety, but upon wealth expended in mere sensual personal gratification. She who hath a britshka shall despise her of the poney-chaise—he of the butler and grooms, him of the boy or waiting-maid—he of Chablis, him of Cape Madeira—she of as many bonnets as she pleases, her of only as many as she wants, &c., &c., &c. What a base contemptible standard of estimation, either for ourselves or others! the attention turned incessantly upon all these barren *misères*, as the French well call them, the imagination perishes, the finer parts of intellect and of morals are neglected, the heart hardens and withers, till all that is generous and independent in thought and feeling are utterly lost, for mind,—in this society of false distinctions, many as are the kickers so many are the kicked; every one feels his dignity offended by the insolent contempts of those above,—in the same degree that his arrogance offends the feelings of those below; he fills equally two, and, it might be thought, incompatible conditions—at once a conceited tyrant and a slave.

It is a very great mistake to suppose that the arrogant spirit of exclusiveness, of which we are speaking, is the result of any extraordinary refinement of manners: it is the reverse. Somebody said, all the beauty in England was to be found among the higher aristocracy and the maid-servants; we were about to say the same thing of simplicity, ease, politeness of manners, and the absence of this ridiculous pride; but it is to be feared that though not higher than the aristocracy, we must go lower than the maid-servants for these pleasing qualities; as far as the denizens of the housekeeper's room, at least, are concerned, who, it must be allowed, are in general very particularly distinguished by the elegant and exclusive fastidiousness of their notions and manners.

Sometimes this amiable spirit will take a somewhat less sordid form, but it is the same spirit still.

Thus complains, and describes, this man of imagination and genuine refinement:—

> "The society of Gibraltar is only animated by the spirit of *commérage*;" (as we should say exclusiveness,) "every one is trying to exclude his neighbour from the circles to which he has himself penetrated; to enter in and slap the door in the face of the neighbour who follows at his heels is the aim of his ambition, the business of his life. Imagine the ease, facility of manners, politeness, grace of conversation, charm of mind, that must result from such a judicious direction of every one's powers. The taste for the *fashionable,* which we are beginning to borrow from the English, is just that which, in my opinion, is most completely antipathetical to true elegance—that elegance which arises from delicacy of taste, liveliness of intellect, or charm of expression. The governor endeavours, in vain, to inspire his countrymen with that spirit which used once, and ought ever, to characterise *le grande monde,* and to give to the society here, those habits of ease and liberty without which true society cannot exist; but the prejudices of *caste* are too strong for him. There are here merchants, distinguished for their liberality and elegance, but they only visit among themselves, the wives of the officers having decided that *good* society, *la haute société,* is only to be found in their own circle, that is to say, among the military and strangers; what can be more tiresome? Strangers, that is, accidental travellers, stay a very short time, and military men have not usually much to say for themselves. An assembly merely composed of officers and their families is usually the stupidest in the world."

The standard of exclusion here, it is true, does not seem to be wealth, but the spirit and principle are just as vulgar and silly; the indulgence of vanity, conceit, and arrogance, in preference to selection and taste, are precisely what marks vulgarity.

The complaints our refined marquis makes of the English modes of living are less serious, but not less just.

> " What satisfaction for a genuine *Anglomane* to find at his entrance into Gibraltar, the small Brighton houses, the London causeways, the gigs, the nursery-maids, &c. &c. He cannot believe that twenty provinces, some of them kingdoms, lie between London and Calpe. But when the first delighted surprise is over, will he find it very pleasant to broil his feet upon carpets, because in London there is seldom a day when that species of furniture is not acceptable? As for myself, a cool mat from the Phillippines, in the heat of the dog-days, is more agreeable to me—fruit from Seville, ham from Malaga, wine from Alicant—than with my legs swelling on a woollen carpet, tearing with my teeth a hard beefsteak from Devonshire, (they victual the garrison with oxen from England,) to stuff myself with Irish potatoes, and swallow liquid fire, in the shape of Xeres, made up with brandy for the English market. Picture to yourself the delight of an English table, and English furniture, in a small room of English dimensions, and the climate of the coast of Barbary."

From Gibraltar our traveller proceeds by Ronda to Grenada, a journey at that time (about nine years ago), and still at the present day, made with the greatest difficulty, not to say danger; a military escort is now necessary to defend the traveller not only from the brigands, but from the *vateros,* or peasants turned into occasional brigands, who dishonour the high calling by a brutality and rapacity, always despised, and often punished by those regularly of the profession.

The inns, like those in old romances, wretched hovels, abodes of the last degree of dirt and misery, are most often kept by those in communication with the robbers, so that, to travel with the least degree of security, it is necessary that the day of departure and plan of route should be not only concealed, but falsely represented—an expedient which seems to succeed in most cases, though perpetually repeated.

The country lies before the traveller savage, barren, uncultivated; he traverses the mountain precipices upon his sagacious Andalusian steed, the most supple, gentle, and sagacious of animals; and from time to time, amid the barren wilderness, the vestiges of the ancient Moorish civilization refresh the weary spirit with the recollection of that elegant and joyous race, those lovers of flowers, gardens, and fountains.

"I shall never forget Gaucin; the deep precipices on one side absolutely garlanded with verdant groves, planted as it were by magic round the sterile barren mountain. There the running streams had been led from rock to rock, and divided with an art peculiar to this people, nourishing at an extraordinary height the fig-tree, the vine, the Indian fig, and thousands of plants in the crevices of the rocks. It was Sunday when we entered the town built on the summit of the mountain—the mandoline, the guitar, and the gay clatter of the castanettes sounded on every side. From time to time some young coquette girl would open a shutter and display the gay groupes within the *patio*, executing Boleros, &c. The scene is a paradise to the imagination, and one returns in enchantment to the Posada. A Posada does not mean properly an inn; it is a chamber with four bare walls, and absolutely nothing else; no provisions, not even beds, every thing has to be brought in from the town—we were dying of hunger and fatigue, and it being Sunday, nothing was to be had. With infinite difficulty we at last procured a few eggs and some goat's milk, and after much delay a few hard straw mattrasses, on which our invalid was laid without undressing, for sheets were out of the question."

Some one has said, that in Andalusia you find all the superfluities and none of the necessaries of life.

The first view of Ronda is astonishing; the town is built upon two plateaux terminating a double-peaked mountain, the peaks separated by a deep and narrow ravine, so narrow, that it is only twenty feet wide at top; the sides of the ravine are precipitous ledges of rock, and a torrent flows at the bottom, one hundred feet below the town.

"This situation gives occasion for most extraordinary effects; much labour and ingenuity has been expended to provide a lodging for man in this eagle's nest: and in a situation fit only as it should seem for birds of prey and the wild beasts of the forest, you find a gay, lively, voluptuous people. The sides of the ravine are united by a bridge of no very considerable span, but the loftiest arch I ever remember to have beheld—it makes a man dizzy to look down from it—it is three hundred feet above the bottom of the ravine—the two principal streets of the town are thus united, and form in fact one—the river tosses and rages below, and passing under the arch tumbles from rock to rock till it rushes into the plain one mass of foam. The bridge crowns the precipitous rocks; there are two arches, one below the other, the lower one to support the wall of masonry of immense height, which serves as foundation to the upper one. Seen from below you may imagine the arches to form the gates of heaven and hell; one, the blue sky seen through it—the other covering the dark impenetrable depths of the ravine. From above, men and trees at the foot of the rock are almost invisible. The ravines in the wilder parts of the precipice are filled with plants and trees, their tints and outlines blended by the shade into a deep hue of green; it is a natural tapestry embroidered with foliage and flowers. Add to this the different accidents of light under an African sun striking in its full splendour against the faces of the precipice, and if you can picture to yourself this combination seen from the midst of a town you perhaps never even heard of before, you will have some idea of one of the least known and most singular towns in Europe. Ronda is the Tivoli of Spain."

The description of the mountain and little town of Casarabonella shall terminate these extracts. It is interesting as a specimen of the extraordinary richness and beauty which the system of irrigation, as pursued by the Moors, produces in this sunny climate:—

"The little town of Casarabonella is again an enchanted garden. Here we find a fresh example of the art of irrigation, which the Spaniards have borrowed from the Moors, and which in parts of Andalusia is still carried out in perfection. The waters of the mountain on which the town stands nourish galleries as it were of verdure; groves planted in terraces one above the other. The methods of watering are various; sometimes a buffalo turns a wheel to which are fixed pots of coarse earthenware, in which the water is raised and poured into a canal, from which it is conducted by innumerable streams to the valley below. Sometimes a tawny gipsy conducts the operation by managing a simple hydraulic machine formed in the very infancy of science.

"The paths to these various terraces, cut in zig-zag up the rocks, are shaded by fig and orange trees, as fresh and as green as if planted in the richest and most temperate of regions: a perpetual spring is maintained by human industry upon this pyramid of marble. We travelled under arches of pomegranate, oranges, and figs, refreshed by the pleasant sound of the little cascades falling on all sides, and giving to the whole mountain a voice, as it were, of many waters. This verdant mountain of Casarabonella, surrounded as it is by burnt, arid, ambered rocks, reminded me of a nosegay in a vase of common stone ware. In this land of contrasts it was one of the strongest.

"Descending, I admired the thickets of rose laurel, (oleander,) with flowers of extraordinary size and beauty, mingled with the pomegranates, whose scarlet flowers seemed like the glancing crest of some gaudy birds; the pistachios, with green, shining, elegant leaves, the vines that clothed the rocks, the figs with their large cottony leaves, under which it is said no serpent can live, unite to give a magic charm to the scenery.

"Nor must the tamarinds, with their delicate branches waving like light aigrettes, nor the fantastic cactus, nor the blue aloes, nor the yuccas, nor the bushes of myrtle, nor the tufts of Palma Christi, nor the Spanish genistas, nor the rosemarys, nor the thousand and thousand other flowers be forgotten. Orange trees of great age are planted in rows like the apple-trees in Normandy; the air is literally perfumed, and the senses intoxicated with sweetness.

"But descend into the plain, this Eden disappears; these rich productions of a well-managed system of united heat and moisture, are as yet in great measure a secret, except to the inhabitants of this country, and no doubt inherited from their unfortunate predecessors; here the mountain is a garden, the valley a desert. The waters are lost in the sand before they reach the foot of the rocks, and the traveller, leaving his terraces and water-courses of marble, sorrowfully buries his feet in the dry bed of what is now no longer a river.

"The dry chirp of the cricket succeeds to the music of birds, the harsh thistle to the myrtle and orange-tree; his throat parched with heat, his tongue cleaving to the roof of his mouth, haggard, dizzy, thirsty, and breathless, the traveller pursues his weary way through the desert."

But we cannot follow further. It is time to leave the Marquis to pursue his route to Grenada, to visit the loved capital of that interesting and fanciful people, who have left the vestiges of their taste in architecture as in gardening.

The book may be safely recommended to all those who take pleasure in this sort of reading; it is one of those once taken up that is not easily laid down.

Lively, imaginative, and interesting, and free, without exception, from the too common reproach of French literature. There is neither grossness, nor irreligion, to be met with in its pages.

M.

SONNET.

Channing! across the murm'ring ocean waves,
Thy voice hath reach'd our shores, strong in the might
Of truth, of sympathy with human right,
Of him who from the world's corruption saves,
From sin's fierce bondage, and the darksome night
Of ignorance, and into glorious light
Leads the exalted Spirit. Freedom laves
Thy soul in her bright waters, sends it forth
With earnest eloquence, from south to north,
From east to west, in palaces and caves,
Of earth forlorn, to plead her holy cause;
To show how deeply written are her laws
In the true human heart, so that all good
Is only found where they are understood.

E. C.

ART. VII.—A LETTER TO THE RIGHT REVEREND THE LORD BISHOP OF LONDON, ON HIS LORDSHIP'S OPPOSITION TO THE PROPOSED REFORMATION OF THE LAWS OF CLERICAL SUBSCRIPTION. By HENRY ERSKINE HEAD, A.M., Rector of Feniton, Devon, and Chaplain to His Majesty the King of Hanover. London. John Green.

WE give some extracts from this bold and certainly able letter by a Rector, and a Chaplain to the King of Hanover, for the sake of exhibiting the necessary consequences of all pretences to uniformity, the inwardly struggling and conscience torn condition of a *fenced and articled* Church. These are most pitiable, but most instructive, confessions. Who are more to be compassionated (men who do not know themselves, will use a stronger word) than those who administer religion without a free and clear spirit, with wounded, doubtful, upbraiding hearts? It is distinctly avowed in these confessions, that the Church of England imposes on her servants a load they cannot erectly bear,—suborns to insincerity the ministers of God.

"Modern improvements are cherishing the spirit of inquiry. The post-office and the railroads lend their aid. Pamphlets, full of strictures and criticisms on the faults of our rituals, are flying through the length and breadth of the land. Meetings are held. The Church canons, and other ecclesiastical laws, are brought to the test of common sense. Opponents, not ignorant of polemics, and exasperated by many an overt act of ecclesiastical exclusiveness, are assailing our vulnerable points—and the worst of their arguments is, that they are just,—I mean as far as regards the laws of subscription.

"On the other hand, the champions of the Church, for the most part, avert their eyes from those things which imperatively demand their attention. The Archbishop of Canterbury asserts that there is nothing in our rituals to give offence to any denomination of Christians; or some such reckless assertion, which his Grace never appears to have retracted. Many of our preachers are so busy in preaching the Establishment that they have no time to repair its breaches; and many more surrender their minds and judgments to the Oxford tract writers,—men as much opposed to the true gospel of Christ—the "faith which was once delivered to the saints"—as the idolators in Ezekiel worshipping their idols, and turning their backs upon the temple of the Lord."

* * * * * *

"It fares ill with the clergyman who speaks of the weak parts of the Establishment, with a view to their emendation. He may point to the black rock of apostacy to which the Church (like the ship in the Arabian tale) is drawn every day nearer—in vain. He is sure to be censured, to say the least, as one that steps out of his sphere. So, when the ship's carpenter reported to his commander, before it was too late, that the *Royal George* was sinking, he was haughtily repulsed, as one that had presumed to dictate to his superior; his advice was derided, and the gallant ship sank beneath the waves.

"Such censures, however, are not confined to the inferior ministers of the Church. Two of her Prelates, the Archbishop of Dublin and the Bishop of Norwich, have called the attention of the public to the question of modifying the terms of clerical subscription—a measure which strikes at the root of much that is evil in the Establishment, and promises to promote its enlargement, reformation, and stability. But have they—has the Bishop of Norwich especially, received the thanks of his brethren for his patriotic exertion in this righteous cause? Yes—such thanks as the generous men of Judah awarded their deliverer, when they gave him bound into the hand of the enemy at Ramoth Lehi."—pp. 4, 5.

"'He (the Bishop of London) thought that if they were to permit a clergyman, declaring that he subscribed to the articles, *ex animo*, to take them in any sense he pleased, they might as well permit him not to subscribe them at all.'"

"Now the fact is, the clergy *do* 'take them in any sense they please.' The great giant who was shut up in a little box—Milton's angels, which were all of a sudden transformed into pigmies—suffered less in their corporeal dimensions than the Articles suffer in their grammatical sense. They are made to be, contrary to their own nature, so wonderfully and notoriously elastic, as to suit the creed of every clergyman in the Queen's dominions, from the stumbling Pelagian to the supralapsarian Calvinist.

"Yet your lordship would have us believe that rigorous subscription is a 'security against error.' This your Lordship will not find easy to prove. It might be easier to show that the abolition of rigorous subscription would be a 'security' against endless prevarications and perversions of plain language. Against what 'error' has rigorous subscription ever proved a 'security?' Which of us has ever been hindered by rigorous subscription from blundering in many points of doctrine? To preserve the Articles reverently in the Prayer Book is one thing—to exert rigorous subscription to them is another. These two things are perfectly distinct. If any of us have been benefitted by the Articles, this has been owing, not to our having rivetted them upon ourselves with oaths and adjurations, but to the blessed influence of the Eternal Spirit, who has gradually developed to our minds and hearts the inestimable system of doctrine they contain.

"The truth is, that the principle of private judgment which your Lordship so strenuously deprecates *is* embraced and acted upon every day, even by those who disavow it. On the principle of private judgment and liberty of conscience, every clergyman gives *his own* interpretation of the Articles. So obviously necessary is this principle in the ministerial office, that it *will* show and exert itself maugre all subscriptions, and every thing that can be said or done against it. Hence it is to be inferred, that that which is acted upon by general connivance, should be openly recognised as an established principle. This is just and reasonable. He who is fit to be admitted to the sacred office, is fit to be trusted to preach his own interpretations."—p. 9.

We direct especial attention to the concluding statement:—

"I have no hesitation, my Lord, in asserting, that it is barely possible for any man having a clear view of the leading principles of Scripture, to remain in the Church of England as a Minister: and *quite* impossible for such a man to *enter* it as a Minister, owing to the stringency of clerical subscription. This is the fact, though, of course, it will be denied with the utmost virulence by those who are interested, my Lord, in concealing the truth."—p. 12.

THE SOWER.

Sow in the Spring of life thy seed,
The Autumn gathering shall come,
And thou shalt reap thy every deed
In the eternal harvest-home;
Then scatter wide the hallowed seeds of duty,
They shall return to thee in endless beauty.

And in the glowing Summer sow,
If Spring unheeded passed away,
The time for energy is—now!
Prepare thee for the gathering day.—
Fling freely o'er thy soul the germs of truth,
They shall redeem thee from the sins of youth.

Even the seeds in Autumn set,
Will catch the pale year's sickly smile;
The harvest home may not be yet;—
For duty yet there may be time.
Oh! seize that precious time, thò' life be hoary,
It yet may lead thee on to scenes of glory.

INTELLIGENCE.

TENTH REPORT OF THE IRISH UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN SOCIETY, 1840.

It is with feelings of no ordinary character, that your Committee, on the present occasion, come before you to make their Annual Report, and to restore into your hands the trust confided to them at your last Anniversary.

Your Society has now been in existence for ten years; and the experience of that period testifies, not only that an extensive sphere of usefulness is open to us, but that we possess powers and capabilities to enable us to operate effectually within that sphere, and to accomplish some, if not many of the important objects contemplated by the originators of the society.

Some of the objects originally in view, which are highly desirable, if within your means, have been hitherto kept in abeyance by the very limited extent of your funds. But we trust it will be found, on examination, that the ground which was open, and upon which your means enabled you to enter, has not been left unoccupied.

It is to be borne in mind, that your society never expected or promised instantaneous changes, or immediately prominent results. Those who deal with the passions or imaginations of man, can agitate the masses at their will, and produce remarkable outbreaks, and extraordinary popular excitement. We studiously avoid these more than doubtful aids, and address ourselves, as far as possible, to the reasoning and rational man. The improvements, therefore, for which we labour, are necessarily gradual; and we are neither disappointed nor dissatisfied when we find, practically, the time it requires to mark, with distinct traces, our slow but certain progress. Even where individuals love the Truth for its own sake, and are prepared to inquire, it is not the work of an hour, or a day, to overcome ancient prejudices, and to remove popular errors, which have been skilfully engrafted on and made palatable to the weaknesses of humanity. But how few are prepared to inquire! Unfortunately, the many amongst Protestants are powerfully influenced by a notion of their own and their clergy's infallibility. Too many of our Protestant brethren seem to deny the possibility of their being in error; and manifest the obstinacy of their own decision, and deter others from inquiry, by sentencing to everlasting destruction the soul of him, who though equally sincere, and equally competent with themselves to understand and interpret the oracles of God, has been obliged, on a careful and diligent perusal of the Bible, to reject the favoured doctrines, as self-contradictory, unwarranted, and unscriptural inventions of men.

The number prepared, or possessing the boldness to prosecute inquiry as to the religious truths we present, is nearly limited to those who have been startled by the light that has broken in on them by the perusal of the scriptures, and have been overwhelmed by the painful and anxious feelings which arise from a growing conviction, that the popular and creed-taught views withhold from the majesty of God the glory which is his due. To those of this class who have approached us, (and their numbers have exceeded what could reasonably have been expected,) we have assisted in bringing consolation and peace, and have aided them in their progress towards the glorious truth—that the religion the scriptures reveal, and well-ordered reason approves, leaves no blot on the attributes of the Almighty, and whilst it brings back to God his glory, brings with it the true love of Christ, and peace to men.

But the operations of this society have not been confined to persons holding opposing doctrines. We have reason to know that the valuable works circulated through the means of the society, have enlightened and invigorated many of ourselves.

Can any true Unitarian be insensible to the importance of this result of our labours, or slothful in still further promoting it, both by *practice* and precept? Since your formation as a society, we have seen, and to some extent contributed to the establishment of seven new and promising congregations. Ballymoney, Ballyhemlin, Carrickfergus, Saintfield, or Ravara, Comber, Raloo, and Belfast, have each had, since your formation as a society, new and handsome houses erected for the worship of the One, Living, and True God. And although the praise, under heaven, is due to the noble-spirited laymen in these new congregations, and to the courageous and unceasing energy of the talented clergy in those districts, who fed and encouraged the flock in its infancy, we rejoice to think that we, too, according to our means, were assistant in the good work. Your records now happily testify that your gratuities of books and other assistance and encouragement to most of these new congregations in their early struggles, have been productive of important benefit.

Your direct connection with one part of the north of Ireland has become, during the last year, less necessary, in consequence of the reorganization of the Belfast society, which had been for some time almost dormant. To its members we had, with a fraternal spirit, repeatedly appealed, to join and co-operate with us, or to re-establish themselves. Our appeal has not been in vain. The master minds and noble spirits who have presided over its re-construction, and are now its members or guardians, have given us a worthy response. The power and energy it has, in its re-juveniscence, displayed, give splendid promise of stability and usefulness. It has already published some excellent tracts; and its anniversary sermons last October, and its crowded soirée, were of a character to excite the most animating confidence and happy anticipations.

Connected with the North, we may further point attention to the fact, that the views of one of the talented individuals who at your last anniversary addressed you, have been brought further into operation there, by the establishment of a Sunday School Society for the assistance of those who, as Bible Christians, and rejecters of creed-worship, were flung aside by the General Sunday School Society. We are happily informed that there is not one of our congregations in the north of

Ireland that has not now under its own charge a flourishing Sunday School. Beset, as we have been, by the effects of ignorance, prejudice and mis-information, in those who oppose and revile us, we look to the judicious and proper education of youth with the deepest and most serious interest. May our brethren be early instructed and impressed with the doctrine, which too many of other communions forget, that the law of Love is one of the chief commandments, and, that if we hate our brother, whom we have seen, we cannot be expected to love our Heavenly Father, whom we have not seen!

ST. MARK'S CHAPEL, EDINBURGH.

We are requested by the Committee of the Edinburgh Unitarian Congregation to intimate that the Pulpit of St. Mark's Chapel will be vacant in May next, in consequence of the retirement of the Rev. R. E. B. Maclellan. The congregation wish to hear of a successor properly qualified by talent and education to fill the office of Pastor in their Church.

CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN CHURCH, ABERDEEN.

This church was opened for the worship of God the Father Almighty, through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, on the 9th of August. The weather was exceedingly propitious; and long before the time of service, the pews, aisles, and lobbies of the church were crowded. Hundreds of persons were unable to get even within the outer gates, and throughout the day the audiences were large and deeply attentive.—The Rev. J. Cropper, the minister of the church, commenced the service by giving out from a selection of Hymns for the occasion, one composed by the Rev. William Gaskell, of Manchester. The Rev. Dr. Montgomery, of Belfast, read the Scriptures and prayed. The Rev. G. Harris, of Glasgow, preached from 1 John iv. 14—16, on the Fatherly character of God, as expressed in Nature and Revelation, and its vital importance as a doctrine of faith and consolation to the Christian believer. His discourse, as usual, was listened to with intense interest, growing manifestly to its close as the preacher solemnly and eloquently dedicated the place they were assembled in to the worship of the one true and living God the Father, through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.—In the afternoon, Dr. Montgomery performed the whole service, taking for his text Acts xxviii. 22. From this he took occasion to show what were the peculiar doctrines of Unitarians, and to contrast them with those of the Church of Scotland, as expressed in the Westminster Confession of Faith, and in the works of some of their most eminent divines. The illustrations on both points were exceedingly striking; and the contrasted statements between Calvinism and Christian Unitarianism must, we feel persuaded, have made a deep and lasting impression on the minds of the audience.—Mr. Harris conducted the introductory service in the evening, and Dr. Montgomery preached from Romans xiv. 12, 13. He stated and replied to the charges usually brought against Unitarians, with a force and eloquence it has not been our privilege ever before to listen to; and we are happy to know that some who were our opponents were led by this discourse to think more favourably of our doctrines.

OPENING OF THE DUCKINFIELD CHAPEL.

This beautiful chapel was opened for public worship on Wednesday, 26th August. The officiating ministers were the Rev. James Hawkes, of Nantwich, (formerly minister at Duckinfield), the Rev. J. G. Robberds, and the Rev. Robert Aspland, of Hackney. Mr. Aspland preached an able, and in the especial portions arising out of the occasion, most effective sermon, with great energy and animation. A large attendance of ministers and laymen from all parts of the country manifested their sympathy and respect for the valued minister of the place, the Rev. Robert Brook Aspland, and his influential and important congregation. A collection was made amounting to £119.

LETTER TO THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE PROPRIETORS OF THE CHURCH IN FEDERAL STREET. (DR. CHANNING'S.)

Boston, May 1, 1840.

Gentlemen,—This day being the beginning of our parochial year, I think it a fit season for a communication which I have for some time intended to make. I have, as you may recollect, proposed more than once to relinquish my salary, but have as often been requested by the Society to retain it. The last request was communicated to me by the Hon. J. Davis and the Hon. J. Welles, with a kindness which I shall always remember with gratitude. I observed to them, that one reason for relinquishing the salary was, that, by receiving it, I should excite expectations, which I might not be able to fulfil. But I was assured, that I was to consider myself as wholly free, and to preach only when it might be convenient. I have never lost the hope of being strengthened for greater public labors; but as yet it has not been realized. Under this experience I have gradually reduced my salary, and have resolved definitely to relinquish it from this day. It is also my wish and purpose, that all my public functions should cease. I do not desire, however, that a formal dissolution of our connexion should take place. Having sustained the relation of pastor nearly forty years, it will be gratifying to me that it should continue, whilst circumstances remain as they are. I wish that the members of the Society may feel that they have a right to seek friendly and spiritual counsels from me, when in need of such, and that I may have a right to communicate with them, when I can hope to do them good. I beg, however, that it may be understood, that the prosperity of the Society is far dearer to me than any personal gratification of this nature; and if it should be thought best, that there should be a formal dissolution of the relation, I desire that this may immediately take place.

In thus bringing my public labors among you to an end, I cannot but acknowledge with gratitude that kind Providence, which has sustained me so many years amidst much physical infirmity, and which has made it the employment of my life to study and teach the religion of Jesus Christ. After a long experience, I feel that life could not have been devoted to a more worthy end. My time has been given chiefly to the work of acquiring juster, clearer, more quickening views of truth and duty. In this pursuit I have spent my strength, and cheerfully surrendered most of what are called the pleasures of life. That in so doing I have obeyed a divine impulse, I believe; but I may have followed it too exclusively. The inquiries and contemplations, which belong to my profession, may have encroached on its more active duties. My studies, which would have been light to a man of ordinary strength, have produced almost daily an exhaustion, which has left me little spirit for social intercourse. It might have been better for myself and for others, had I more frequently torn my mind from the subjects which have absorbed almost my whole intellectual energy. For this error, if such it be, I ask and hope a lenient judgment, because I have not given myself to intellectual indulgence, but have carried into my seclusion a sincere, and I hope a growing interest in my fellow-creatures, and in the Christian cause. Other and more serious deficiencies I might recall. Indeed no one can feel, more than I do, the imperfections of my ministry. For these I desire forgiveness of God and man. Still I do not feel as if had labored in vain. My public services have been listened to with interest, and I have had proofs, for which I am most grateful, that deeper effects than transient interest have been produced by my ministry. Not that I have accomplished what I wished. As a people, I fear, we are greatly wanting in that spiritual elevation, that superiority to the world, that love of God, of Jesus Christ, and of mankind, which is the end of religious institutions. In truth, all our churches need a new life, a new comprehension of the spirit and high purpose of Christianity. This I say for the truth's sake, and in sorrow of heart, and not from any wounded feelings under the consciousness of having exerted no greater influence. As far as I am personally concerned, I have nothing to complain of, no reproaches to utter. I have received for many years expressions of kindness, for which I offer my sincere thanks. It is indeed a gratifying consideration, that our long union has not been disturbed even by a word of contention. I am not aware that a thought or emotion of unkindness has risen within me towards one of my parishioners. Were I now to leave them, I could from the heart bid an affectionate farewell to *all*.

I have spoken of the past. It is natural for me at such a moment to cast a look towards the future. It is possible, that some sphere of action, not now anticipated, may open on me. It is more probable, that my present sphere will be contracted. When I look round me, I see not one of the ministers who filled the pulpits of this city at my ordination. All have gone to their account; and not a few, settled since, have also passed away. He, who seemed destined to go among the first, survives alone. Can I help applying to myself the language of the apostle, "The time of my departure is at hand"? Nor is the time very distant, when all, to whom I have ministered, will have entered the unknown world. It is my fervent prayer, that we may meet in the temple "not made with hands," and that a holier worship than has united us here may bind us together for ever.

I may on another occasion express my feelings more fully to the Society. I earnestly desire that they may continue to enjoy the labours of their devoted pastor, and that through this and other means of religion, their harmony may be perpetuated, and their spiritual improvement never cease. With respect and affection, your friend,

WM. E. CHANNING.

Reply.

THE PROPRIETORS AND CONGREGATION OF THE CHURCH IN BERRY STREET TO THEIR SENIOR PASTOR, THE REVEREND WILLIAM ELLERY CHANNING, D.D.

REV. AND DEAR SIR,—We have received from the Standing Committee of the Proprietors the letter you addressed them on the first instant, announcing your purpose, from that day, to relinquish the small remainder of salary, which, at our earnest request, you had, till then, consented to receive from us; and expressing your desire that, without formally dissolving the connexion that has so long and so happily subsisted between us, your public functions, as a minister of Christ to this Society, may cease.

We do not wish to conceal from you, that we receive this decision with regret and pain. Perhaps we feel it the more sensibly, because it seemed to be our duty to acquiesce in it, and thus make it final. For several years we have known that you considered such a separation, as you now propose, desirable on account of the state of your health, and if we have heretofore been unwilling to give it our concurrence, it has been from feelings of respect and attachment to yourself, that have grown old in many of our hearts, and sunk deep in all of them. We may, from these feelings, have resisted your wishes longer than we ought to have done, but we hope and trust we have not been unreasonable; and now that the time has arrived, when we are not permitted to hesitate in giving to them our full assent, it gratifies us, that you do not seek to make the separation absolute and entire, but that you are desirous on your part, as we are on ours, to retain some of the bonds that have united us during a connexion that has been permitted to be so happy and to last so long.

You allude to the possibility that some inconvenience may hereafter arise to us from the continuance of these bonds. We anticipate none. We can imagine nothing but good from their continuance. Still, if in the course of Providence, any inconvenience should be felt, we shall, in the spirit of frankness, with which you have spoken of our union and its motives, avail ourselves of your permission to dissolve it, trusting, that, with the same frankness, you would claim the right you grant; and if it should at any time seem important or desirable to you to exercise it, that you would do so, and separate yourself from us wholly. We do not, however, suppose it at all likely that either party will take a step, which we are sure neither would take but with great reluctance, and from a strong sense of duty; and we allude to its possibility, only because you have done so, and because we think it important that both should feel perfectly free to act in circumstances that cannot be foreseen.

Our connexion, as you intimate, has been continued through a longer period than could at first have been anticipated,—a period indeed so long, that few remain among us, who bore witness to its beginning. You came to us thirty-seven years ago, when our numbers were so few and our circumstances so humble, that it was apparent you came only from a sense of duty, and from a disinterested desire to serve your fellow-men. Under your care, however, we soon prospered and grew numerous. But, at every step of our progress, we felt that, under God's good Providence, we owed it chiefly to you. We have, too, as we trust, been thankful for the ministrations we have enjoyed. We have certainly felt them to be a privilege—a great privilege—and we have greatly valued them. Nor has their influence been confined to ourselves. They have been felt and acknowledged beyond the limits of our own Society, beyond the limits of our own country; and we trust that even yet neither their work nor yours is wholly accomplished. We trust, that, long after both you and we are gone to render up our last account, your spirit, in the record of what you have here spoken, will be still active in the great cause of Christ and of human improvement, to which you have devoted your life. The only regret we feel, when looking back upon the period of your connexion with us, is, that we have not profited, as we ought to have done, by the privileges we have enjoyed; that we have not become spiritual, and superior to the world; devoted to duty, as you have laboured to make us. We pray God to forgive us for our deficiencies, and to make your teachings more effectual to the generations that are to come after us, than they have been to us and to our own.

We feel gratified by the suggestion, that your public labours may not wholly cease; and that you may not only speak again to us, but that it is possible you may become active in some other sphere of usefulness. Amidst whatever circumstances the course of God's Providence may place you, we doubt not that your influence will be elevating and improving; and that we shall always witness and share its effects with thankfulness, seeking such personal and more immediate intercourse with you, as our relative positions may permit and authorize, and looking to you, at all times, as to a Christian pastor and spiritual friend.

It is, we know, a satisfaction to you, as it is to us, that you do not leave us alone, but that we remain under the ministrations of the able and devoted pastor who has been so long associated with you. We pray, for your sake, as well as for our own, that his health may be fully restored; and that his services, such as you have yourself been accustomed to witness and share them, may be yet many years continued to us and to our children. We can desire nothing better than such fidelity and devotedness as his, except a corresponding faithfulness on our own part to improve by them.

In conclusion, we would invoke on you the blessings you have so often besought for us, adding, for the sake of the cause of Christianity and human improvement, our prayers that your strength and health may be increased, and that your faculties may be preserved unimpaired to a remote and happy old age.

On behalf of the Proprietors and the Congregation of Berry Street Church.

Samuel Greele, Chairman.

HISTORICAL MEMOIR OF DR. TUCKERMAN, FROM THE BOSTON MONTHLY MISCELLANY OF RELIGION AND LETTERS.

Joseph Tuckerman was born in Boston, January 18, 1778. Of the early instructions of his mother, a truly pious woman, he always spoke with peculiar gratitude. His youth was passed in preparation for College partly at Phillips' Academy in Andover, and partly in the family of the Rev. Mr. Thacher of Dedham. In 1794 he entered Harvard College, where he was graduated in 1798, as one of the class to which Judge Story and Rev. Dr. Channing also belonged. His preparatory studies for the ministry were pursued under the direction of Rev. Mr. Thacher of Dedham. Soon after he began to preach, he received an invitation to become the successor of Rev. Dr. Payson at Chelsea, where he was ordained November 4, 1801. In June 1803, he was married to a daughter of the late Samuel Parkman, Esq., of this city, who died in the summer of 1807. In November 1808 he was again married to Miss Sarah Cary of Chelsea, who after thirty-one years of the most happy connection was taken to a higher life, leaving a remembrance dear to the hearts of a large circle of friends. In 1816 Mr. Tuckerman visited England in the hope of deriving benefit to his health, but was absent only a short time; after his return he suffered much from dyspepsy, and never recovered the full tone of health. He continued in the active discharge of the duties of his ministry till the spring of 1826, when he felt the necessity of relinquishing in some measure the labours of the pulpit, and his mind, which had become much interested in the condition of the neglected poor of our cities, sought an opportunity of conducting a ministry peculiarly suited to their wants. On the 4th of November, 1826, just twenty-five years from the day of his ordination, he preached his farewell sermon at Chelsea, and immediately commenced his service in Boston, to which place he soon removed with his family. He was at first assisted in this work by a private association of gentlemen, who had for some time held stated meetings for their own religious improvement, and for conference upon the means of benevolent action; but he was very soon appointed a minister-at-large in this city by the Executive Committee of the American Unitarian Association, who became responsible for the small salary which he received, and which for several years was raised by the contributions of ladies in our different congregations. In 1828 the Friend Street Chapel was erected for his use, as a place of worship for those whom he had brought to a sense of the value of religious institutions, but who were unable to pay for the privileges of the sanctuary. His untiring zeal in this ministry, the success of his labours among the poor, and the extent of his influence over the rich, evinced particularly in the confidence which they reposed in him as the almoner of their charities, were subjects of too familiar remark to need any illustration. The ardour with which he prosecuted his labours was too much for his bodily strength, and in 1833 he again visited Europe in company with his friend Mr. Phillips, and passed a year abroad, principally in England, where he formed many valuable friendships, and was instrumental in awakening much interest in his favourite subject—of the moral elevation of the neglected and vicious poor. On his return he found the ministry-at-large placed on a more stable foundation than he had left it, the Benevolent Fraternity of Churches having been organized with a special view to its support. A more commodious chapel was erected, and younger labourers were associated with him. His own ability to render active service was however irretrievably impaired. The winter of 1836-37 he was obliged to spend in the milder climate of St. Croix, from which he returned, as it was thought, much benefitted. But the vital force was too nearly exhausted. Repeatedly prostrated by disease, he rose only to show the steadfastness of those principles and purposes which filled his soul, and sunk again, as if to prove the constancy of the faith which seemed to gain new power from suffering and bereavement. After a severe illness in the autumn of 1839, he so far revived, that after much hesitation a voyage to Cuba was recommended as the only means of prolonging his life. He sailed for Havana, and soon sought the interior of the island; but a short trial proved the hopelessness of the attempt to recruit an exhausted frame, and he returned with the daughter who was his devoted companion to Havana, where after some days of extreme debility, attended with great suffering, he died, April 20, 1840, in his sixty-third year.

Dr. Tuckerman received the honorary degree of Doctor in Divinity from Harvard University in 1826. It was a tribute to his ministerial fidelity. His published writings are few, excepting those which arose from his connection with the ministry-at-large. One of the last services he rendered to this institution was the preparation of a volume, which we fear has not obtained a wide circulation, upon "The Principles and Results of the Ministry-at-large."

At a meeting of the Central Board of the Benevolent Fraternity of Churches, May 10, 1840, the following resolution was unanimously passed:

"*Resolved*, That the death of the Rev. Joseph Tuckerman, D.D., demands on the part of this Board an expression of their deep sense of the value of his services to this community, and that recognizing in him the first incumbent, if not the founder,* of the present institution of the ministry-at-large, they cannot but acknowledge the usefulness of a life, the last years of which were devoted to this institution, in whose service his strength was exhausted; and while they submit to the Divine will, that has deprived them of the counsels and labours of this Christian philanthropist, they would cherish his spirit and hold up his example before themselves and others, as a motive and a guide to future exertions in behalf of the neglected and the sinful."

---

* In strictness of speech it might be doubted if Dr. Tuckerman should be styled the *founder* of the ministry-at-large, as gratuitous instruction to the poor had been given both by laymen and clergymen before his removal to Boston. In 1822 the Association to which we have adverted had established evening religious lectures for those who attended no place of worship during the day; and Rev. Dr. Jenks was employed by another Society in visiting and preaching to the poor. When Dr. Tuckerman came to Boston, his own mind had not clearly defined its plans of operation, and the

A resolution similar in character, was passed at the annual meeting of the American Unitarian Association, May 26, 1840.

Dr. Tuckerman's remains were brought to this country, and the funeral service was attended in King's Chapel, where he had been accustomed to worship during the last years of his life, in the afternoon of May 26. They were afterwards deposited at Mount Auburn. The Association for Religious Improvement, whose members assisted him at the commencement of his labours in this city, wishing to take suitable notice of his death, requested Rev. F. T. Gray to prepare an Address, which was delivered in connection with religious exercises, in the Pitt's Street Chapel, on Tuesday evening, June 9.

idea which was subsequently expanded into the institution of the ministry-at-large had not perhaps proceeded beyond a general purpose of devoting himself to the spiritual benefit of those who had no religious teacher or friend. The Committee of the Amer. Unit. Association must also share in the honour of establishing this ministry. But as it was his perseverance and success that gave both form and efficiency to the institution, it is but a small deviation from accuracy to call him its founder.

RICHARD KINDER, PRINTER,
GREEN ARBOUR COURT, OLD BAILEY.

X

GTU Library
3 2400 00270 0262